Manatee County Public Schools

Lakewood Ranch High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lakewood Ranch High School

5500 LAKEWOOD RANCH BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34211

https://www.manateeschools.net/lakewoodranch

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Lakewood Ranch High School, with the support of staff, parents, and the community, is to strive to inspire each student to recognize and achieve his or her maximum potential through academic excellence, personal integrity, and responsible citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Lakewood Ranch High School is to provide students a rigorous educational experience that equips them for college or career readiness in a global job market.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dahlquist, Dustin	Principal	Administration, Management, and Supervision
Bellantonio, Thomas	Assistant Principal	Administration, Discipline and School Improvement
Staker, Michael	Assistant Principal	Administration, Testing, School Improvement
Galindo, Jeannie	Assistant Principal	Administration, Instruction, School Improvement
Fleury, Ann	Teacher, K-12	Math Department
Thomas, Bryan	Teacher, K-12	Science Department
Grant, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	English Department
Haeussler, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department
Finnegan, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	World Languages, Fine and Performing Arts Department

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Administration team meets daily and the Instructional Leadership Team identified above meets monthly for progress monitoring, data analysis, problem solving and improvement planning. The staff meets collectively to discuss findings and shared goals are written and communicated. Action plans are created by Department in support of school improvement goals. Draft goals are brought to the School's Advisory Committee for discussion, revision, and adoption.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

School improvement happens on campus daily. "How can we get better?" is the theme of feedback given and received as a result of the hundreds of formal and informal interactions between teachers, students, administrators, and support staff. Problem solving is cyclical in nature. Data is analyzed, hypotheses are formulated, actions are prescribed and fidelity is monitored. As new data are collected, response to intervention is analyzed and if necessary, new hypotheses are formulated, actions are prescribed, and fidelity is monitored. This occurs until either goals are met or the bar is raised to higher levels of performance or proficiency.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	24%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	245
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	62	44	50	66	48	51	65		
ELA Learning Gains				58			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			40		
Math Achievement*	60	42	38	51	35	38	48		
Math Learning Gains				42			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			26		
Science Achievement*	79	64	64	79	45	40	84		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	59	66	77	43	48	78		
Middle School Acceleration					37	44			
Graduation Rate	94	84	89	94	63	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	69	61	65	72	66	67	64		
ELP Progress	68	41	45	65			38		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	682
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	94

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	2	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	52			
HSP	60			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	76			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	59			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	41			
HSP	52			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	62			60			79	69		94	69	68
SWD	25			30			44	33		24	6	
ELL	24			30			33	38		21	7	68
AMI												
ASN	81			50			77	83		84	6	
BLK	40			37			53	40		41	6	
HSP	47			49			60	54		57	7	67
MUL	73			63			95	75		61	6	

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	65			64			83	73		73	6	
FRL	43			46			62	52		48	7	74

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	66	58	42	51	42	36	79	77		94	72	65
SWD	25	36	35	20	34	38	34	47		87	41	
ELL	31	46	42	24	35	27	40	41		79	16	65
AMI												
ASN	78	56		57	42		88	82		100	79	
BLK	50	53	38	21	16	11	54	50		88	31	
HSP	48	47	40	37	39	34	56	63		92	58	60
MUL	70	64		55	46		78	68		92	75	
PAC												
WHT	70	61	43	57	46	44	85	82		95	78	
FRL	49	50	41	32	34	28	62	57		87	47	65

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	65	50	40	48	25	26	84	78		96	64	38
SWD	27	41	33	25	31	35	51	58		85	28	
ELL	24	43	44	19	25	22	72	56		88	50	38
AMI												
ASN	74	56		50	33		100	82		100	74	
BLK	26	37	35	16	22	17	52	35		95	37	
HSP	49	43	39	37	28	28	76	69		92	61	39
MUL	68	46		32	17		81	82		100	50	
PAC												
WHT	70	52	43	55	25	31	87	83		96	66	
FRL	42	41	38	30	23	21	68	58		89	49	38

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	62%	44%	18%	50%	12%
09	2023 - Spring	64%	46%	18%	48%	16%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	58%	-7%	50%	1%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	56%	17%	48%	25%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	64%	15%	63%	16%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	63%	5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA achievement at 64 percent. This was 2% drop from the achievement levels attained the prior year. Factors that may have contributed to this drop include the transition from the Florida Standards to the B.E.S.T. standards, the transition from the Florida Standards Assessments to the Florida Assessments of Student Thinking, lack of familiarity to the new instructional materials, and teacher turnover. Teacher retention is critically important as many professionals left the field during the pandemic, fewer college students are entering the field and the political climate has created an uneasiness among teachers in the profession. When jobs are posted, few apply.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was social studies achievement. Proficiency dropped from 77% to 69% which represents an 8% decline. This represents a mystery in many ways as the curriculum and the assessment has remained stable since 2010. Factors that may have attributed to this decline are the personnel shifts that have occurred in the master schedule. Due to retirements and resignations, for example, a teacher who has taught U.S. History for many years has been shifted to Advanced Placement Human Geography or A.P. U.S. History. A younger teacher with less experience with the standards and assessment carries a significant load against this data component.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Lakewood Ranch High School's data represents no gaps when compared to the state average. The state's average for ELA proficiency was 49%. The 64% proficiency achieved at Lakewood Ranch is 15% higher than the state's average proficiency. The same is true for math achievement. The state's average proficiency was 50.7% while Lakewood Ranch High School students achieved 65% proficiency, 14.3% higher than the state's average. The data component showing the lowest performance is still significantly higher than the state's average. Social Studies performance at Lakewood Ranch High School was 69% compared to the state's average of 64%

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the most improvement was math achievement. A 14% increase from 51% to 65% is statistically significant. We attribute much of this increase to a return to in person school post pandemic. Our goals in math the previous years have been to return to pre-pandemic levels of performance. In the 18-19 school year, for example, math proficiency was 74%. Proficiency during the first pandemic year, 20-21, dropped to 48%. The subsequent year saw an increase in math proficiency to 51%. Last year's proficiency of 65% represents continued significant progress toward returning to pre-pandemic proficiency. Other factors that have contributed to the increase include new instructional materials, revised assessments, and teacher experience.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

While the EWS data dashboard does not include data for 9-12, one area of concern is that our students with disabilities remain short of the 41% goal at 40%

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Learning Gains
2. Writing Proficiency

3. Improved Instructional Practice
4. Teacher Retention

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A primary area of focus is teacher retention and recruitment. The single most significant factor in student achievement is the quality of the teacher. Nationally, there is a teacher shortage. That shortage has been felt locally. Where once one might receive 100 or more applicants for a posting, at times, we've seen as few as one or two. Of those, there may not even be an applicant who is highly qualified. Highly effective teachers make the greatest difference when educating students with disabilities. Our students with disabilities are one such sub-group who must have highly effective teachers. They are the only sub-group in our population failing to meet the 41% threshold. While the 1% gap is statistically insignificant, it still represents a gap worth closing. Teachers make the difference and district-wide, many of the vacancies that have remained on the board have been those associated Exceptional Student Education. To close this gap, we must not only hire and retain the best teachers available, we must strive to improve instructional practice for even the most effective.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

During the 23-24 school year, Lakewood Ranch High School will retain 95% (118/124) of its instructional staff, representing a 9% increase from the 21-22 school year and a 8% increase from the 22-23 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

To achieve our goals around teacher retention and improved instructional practice, new teachers will be supported through the new teacher cadre. The cadre meets regularly to support new teachers and teachers new to the school with classroom management, instructional practice, record keeping and communication. Increased targeted walkthroughs will be performed by calibrated staff. Weekly debriefs will be conducted to identify teachers in need of additional support. Plans for providing that additional support will be drafted and administrators assigned to orchestrate that support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dustin Dahlquist (dahlquid@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The Framework for Teaching (FFT) underpins our teacher evaluation rubric. The FFT is an evolving instructional resource that provides a roadmap for effective teaching. It outlines 22 components and 76 elements organized into Four Domains of Teaching Responsibility. Over time, the FFT has evolved to reflect new learning in the field and meet the needs of today's classrooms and students. Throughout the school year, new teachers will take a deeper dive into the elements of the FFT that center around instructional practice and the classroom environment. The goal of that work is to not only identify instructional practices consistent with teacher effectiveness, but also to evaluate the subtle distinctions between practices at the effective and highly effective levels of teacher proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To become an increasingly effective teacher, one must first become aware of the practice associated with levels of effectiveness. Deconstruction of instructional practice and analysis of the varying levels of

effectiveness associated with each takes a complex concept and breaks it down into bite sized actionable bites.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Assemble new teacher cadre
Create Cadre calendar and Agenda based on needs assessment.
New Teacher Nuggets weekly to build effective practice foundation.

Person Responsible: Jeannie Galindo (galindoj@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 1, 2023 and throughout the school year.

Attend job fairs and local teacher recruiting events.

Person Responsible: Dustin Dahlquist (dahlquid@manateeschools.net)

By When: Frequency determined by vacancies.

Identify teachers in need of additional support to formulate action plans to foster growth and development.

Person Responsible: Michael Staker (stakerm@manateeschools.net)

By When: Once calibrated and initial screenings and walks are completed.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

While Lakewood Ranch High School students exceed state proficiency rates, there remains room for improvement. Historically, achieving learning gains has presented a challenge. The last time learning gains were measured was the 21-22 school year. During that year, 58% of all students recorded a learning gain in ELA. The lower quartile of students only achieved 42% learning gains. If we are to achieve our school's mission to "inspire each student to recognize and achieve his or her maximum potential", students must achieve learning gains each year.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In the 23-24 school year 62% of all students, a 4% increase, will achieve a learning gain in ELA as measured by their performance on the PM3 FAST assessment in ELA.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored formally through FAST assessments PM1, PM2 and ultimately PM3. Informally, teachers will monitor progress through in class formative and summative assessments that mirror the state's assessment in form and complexity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeannie Galindo (galindoj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Spiral review is the evidenced-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus. Quantum Learning suggests that students must interact with new learning at multiple intervals. Optimally, those intervals are at 10 minutes after the learning, 24 hours after the learning and 7 days after the learning. This is specifically important for Students with Disabilities who may require multiple opportunities to learn, frequent review and ongoing feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Regularly circling back to previous learning cements understanding and contributes to improved proficiency and retention as what is learned is transferred from short-term memory to long term memory to be retrieved when needed. Additionally, frequent assessment provides critical input to teachers that is used to drive instruction, reteaching, or remediation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Leverage StudySync resources for assignments and assessments that mirror the state assessments in both item type and complexity.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Grant (grantj@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 1, 2023 and daily after that.

Evaluative walkthroughs and non-evaluative classroom visits will be conducted by administrators to monitor for fidelity of implementation and use of core resources to support instruction.

Person Responsible: Michael Staker (stakerm@manateeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

While Lakewood Ranch High School students exceed state proficiency rates, there remains room for improvement. Historically, achieving learning gains has presented a challenge. The last time learning gains were measured was the 21-22 school year. During that year, 42% of all students recorded a learning gain in Math. The lower quartile of students only achieved 36% learning gains. If we are to achieve our school's mission to "inspire each student to recognize and achieve his or her maximum potential", students must achieve learning gains each year.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

During the 23-24 school year, 62% of all students will achieve a learning gain in Math as measured by improvements in their performance on the state's assessments, (Algebra I EOC, Geometry EOC), or a nationally administered assessment, such as the PSAT, SAT, or ACT.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored formally through district quarterly benchmark assessments. Informally, teachers will monitor progress through in class formative and summative assessments that mirror the state's assessments in both form and complexity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Bellantonio (bellantoniot@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

In addition to explicit and differentiated instruction, non-proficient math students will use ACALETICS to close gaps and improve proficiency, contributing to learning gains. On July 19, 2010, ACALETICS was recognized by the Florida Department of Education and the Council for Educational Change (CEC), established by the Florida Annenberg Challenge, as a Best Practice in Mathematics at the 8th Florida Leadership Academy held at the University of South Florida in Tampa.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Proficiency and learning gains in mathematics are dependent upon a solid foundation of prerequisite skills. Students struggle with increased complexity when there are gaps in foundational skills. ACALETICS diagnostics identify gaps. Students are then provided with instruction and practice at their individual level of proximal development, strengthening the foundation to support increased levels of complexity and thereby fostering learning gains.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Evaluative walkthroughs and non-evaluative classroom visits will be conducted by administrators to monitor for fidelity of implementation and use of core resources to support instruction.

Person Responsible: Thomas Bellantonio (bellantoniot@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 1st and quarterly thereafter.

Analyze ACALETICS data to target areas of focus for small group and individual instruction.

Person Responsible: Thomas Bellantonio (bellantoniot@manateeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

Analyze and interpret benchmark data to identify gaps in requisite learning and drive instruction and remediation.

Person Responsible: Ann Fleury (fleurya@manateeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Against the Federal Index, students with disabilities at Lakewood Ranch HS narrowly failed to accrue 41% of the points possible. (40%) While the graduation rate for students with disabilities leads the District at 87%, we believe the opportunities afforded our students with disabilities can be strengthened to improve overall achievement levels.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students with disabilities will accrue points in excess of 41% against the Federal Index for the 23-24 School Year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring will occur as data is analyzed from both classroom and district progress monitoring assessments. Problem solving will occur at the classroom level and at the school level and interventions implemented, tracked and analyzed for positive response to intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Fazio (fazioj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students with disabilities will be provided with in-class, one-on-one inclusion support from certified ESE professionals who work collaboratively with subject specific general education teachers to differentiate instruction and ensure accommodations are provided as prescribed in each student's IEP. Additionally, students with disabilities will be afforded the opportunity to participate in a Learning Strategies class that applies best practice in learning to individual student coursework.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students with disabilities, provided appropriate accommodations, are able to perform at grade level along side their non-disabled peers. The challenge in schools can be the fidelity with which those accommodations are provided. Assigned case managers and inclusion teachers monitoring fidelity of implementation and advocating for students in the classroom promotes learning for all.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Ensure IEPs are current
Hand schedule Students with Disabilities

Cluster students with disabilities with non-disabled peers.
Provide in class inclusion support from certified ESE personnel.

Person Responsible: Julie Fazio (fazioj@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023 and ongoing as needed.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was social studies achievement. Proficiency dropped from 77% to 69% which represents an 8% decline. This represents a mystery in many ways as the curriculum and the assessment has remained stable since 2010. Factors that may have attributed to this decline are the personnel shifts that have occurred in the master schedule. Due to retirements and resignations, for example, a teacher who has taught U.S. History for many years has been shifted to Advanced Placement Human Geography or A.P. U.S. History. A younger teacher with less experience with the standards and assessment carries a significant load against this data component.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

During the 23-24 school year, there will be a 5% increase in Social Studies achievement as measured by the U.S. History EOC exam.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Quarterly common assessments will be used to monitor for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Bellantonio (bellantoniot@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Spiral review is the evidence-based strategy that will be used in U.S. History classes. Bell-work in U.S. History classes will consist of an EOC type question of the day. Students will be given time to analyze response choices resulting in choosing the correct response and identifying why the other choices are incorrect.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for this strategy is that students need practice with questions that mirror the format and complexity of those that will be used to measure their achievement. The practice promotes critical thinking, close reading of question stems and justification for the selection of a response. Over time, this strategy promotes retention of knowledge and confidence choosing the correct response from a variety of choices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

ATSI
State funds are not provided to assist ATSI schools. However, local funds are provided to schools based on PPA in the School District of Manatee County (Mission Critical). These funds can be used and will be used to address areas of focus to support Federal Index Groups that are performing below 41% proficiency. Once schools are given an allocation school leadership team in collaboration with the Executive Directors of Elementary and Secondary review plans and ensure resources are used appropriately.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/a

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No