

Manatee County Public Schools

# H. S. Moody Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# H. S. Moody Elementary School

5425 38TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34209

<http://www.edline.net/pages/sdmcmoodyes>

## Demographics

**Principal: Natalie Jadid**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (46%) 2020-21: (32%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (48%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Moody Elementary is an inclusive community who values collaboration, high expectations, and independent thinking to develop tomorrow's leaders.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is for students to use their thinking and problem solving skills to persevere in meeting their goals.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jadid, Natalie	Principal	Oversees all operations and school improvement efforts in the school.
Francies, Krista	Assistant Principal	Assists in the operations and implementation of the school improvement plans.
Vicencio, Lindsay	Instructional Coach	Coaching teachers
Jett, Sarah	Dean	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/11/2022, Natalie Jadid

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

600

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

10

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

10

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	90	99	93	123	96	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	0	51	41	44	46	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	1	13	23	20	24	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Course failure in ELA	0	0	15	43	31	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	9	14	29	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	33	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	35	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	3	17	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	10	17	23	25	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/31/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	88	101	111	86	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	575
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	7	5	4	11	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	15	28	31	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in Math	0	8	14	27	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	48	37	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	40	23	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	28	31	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	4	31	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	88	101	111	86	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	575
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	7	5	4	11	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	15	28	31	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in Math	0	8	14	27	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	48	37	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	40	23	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	28	31	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	4	31	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	34%			25%			36%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%			34%			49%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%			32%			44%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	50%			39%			48%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	59%			33%			56%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%			45%			37%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	32%			19%			34%	48%	53%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**



ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	31%	51%	-20%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	56%	-23%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					
	2019	37%	52%	-15%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	44%	60%	-16%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	65%	-9%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	60%	-22%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	32%	48%	-16%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	15	45	45	24	41	25	32				
ELL	32	63	50	54	57	38	39				
BLK	24	59		55	63		31				
HSP	35	60	50	48	55	32	32				
MUL	27			47							
WHT	41	53		49	62	50	30				
FRL	30	56	52	44	58	45	21				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	17	36	36	35	36	45	10				
ELL	15	29		38	46	70	4				
BLK	17	21		32	14		15				
HSP	20	37	33	37	39	62	6				
MUL	35			44							
WHT	37	40		46	30		35				
FRL	20	28	33	35	24	23	14				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	34	36	24	39	30	22				
ELL	24	40	44	39	54	45	16				
BLK	19	31	50	27	41	40					
HSP	33	48	36	47	58	40	37				
MUL	42	46		58	62						
WHT	49	58	55	63	59		48				
FRL	35	49	46	48	56	37	31				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	391
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

After analyzing our 2021-22 school data, a common trend became apparent that literacy continues to be an area of need with only 34% of students demonstrating proficiency. Students showed improvement overall the last year improving the unofficial school grade from a D to a C. Students with disabilities federal index is at 34 which is below and this has been the case for the last 5 years.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

For the 2021-22 school year, overall ELA proficiency was 34%, the ELA learning gains were 58% and our L25 gains were 50%. Our 3rd grade ELA proficiency was 30%. our 4th grade ELA proficiency was 42% and our 5th grade ELA proficiency was 31%. The area of comprehension was progress monitored and students continue to struggle with grade level texts.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

In 2021-22, lost learning during Covid years has created deficits in the area of reading. Leadership was changed and was unstable throughout the school year. Attendance of students and staff contributed to the need. Inexperienced teachers, need for training, and pedagogy for at risk students have contributed to the area for growth. New actions would include targeted interventions, tutoring and professional learning for students and teachers to move their learning forward.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

The areas that showed the most improvement from 2020-21 to 2021-2022, were proficiency in ELA from 25 to 34, Math 39 to 50 and Science 19 to 32. Students had learning gains in all area. ELL students showed a learning gain of 23%.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

During the 2021-2022 school year, the students were no longer working through elearning and respond better to in person learning. Math grouping was done to provide instruction by the best teachers for the most students. Extended reading opportunities helped to improve the reading level using reading interventionists for many students.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Collaborative planning for standards based instruction, professional learning communities based on data, and tutoring for students will be provided. Differentiated and targeted support to accelerate learning. Acceleration groups will be implemented for ELA and Math. Core instruction will be focused on grade level rigor.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Based on the factors analyzed, the school will focus on core instruction that is aligned to the BEST Standards using professional learning communities and collaborative planning. Professional learning will be provided in BEST Standards, Formative Assessment, new curriculum materials, engagement and PLCs. During the PLC, professional learning will focus on creating common formative assessments for Literacy, BEST Standards, and striving for high expectations. SWD will be included for all interventions, and core instruction to support on grade level learning and supports.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Continued professional learning in the area of PLCs, standards based instruction, engaging and inclusive practices for SWD and students at risk and ongoing standards learning. These structures will allow for continued professional learning and supports needed to move the school forward.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

From the 2021-2022 FSA data set indicated a need for improvement in the area of Literacy with only 34% of our students showing proficiency. Our 3rd grade ELA proficiency was 30%. our 4th grade ELA proficiency was 42% and our 5th grade ELA proficiency was 31%. This is a critical need for all subjects and future success.

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

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

Our ELA proficiency will increase from 34% to 50 percent as measured FAST state assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

The area will be monitored through District benchmarks, FAST Progress Monitoring, Common Formative Assessments, Assessments from Curriculum and Progress Monitoring of tier 2 and 3 students. Observations of classroom implementation and standards instruction will be conducted and feedback will be provided.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Natalie Jadid (jadidn@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Data driven decision making will be used to adjust learning paths to accelerate learning for students frequently using the data sets described. 6400-120, \$19,500 for year long collaborative planning to support this goal. The focus in these meetings will be to enhance learning in the areas of explicit vocabulary instruction, summarizing, and writing across content areas. Common formative assessments will be created around the BEST standards and administered to monitor progress.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Our student need drives us to differentiate instruction to close gaps and accelerate learning using formative data. Hattie's work shows an effect size for Acceleration .86 and Formative Assessment .90, The strategies selected are high impact strategies selected by our district.

**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.

1. PLC Professional Learning will be provided by the principal.
2. Follow up support in teams to identify Benchmarks, Focus on student need, select evidence based practices will be done by the administrative team with all teams.
3. Data Cycles will be completed to monitor effectiveness of strategies. (Admin and team leaders)
4. Administration, coach and interventionists will observe ELA instruction in Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 to provide feedback, professional learning opportunities and areas for growth.
5. Modeling, instructional walks and coteaching will be used to improve instruction in all classrooms.

**Person Responsible** Natalie Jadid (jadidn@manateeschools.net)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

The BEST ELA and math standards are new for 3rd through 5th grade and teachers will need assistance in the implementation to maintain high levels of student learning. New curricular materials are in place and teachers will need support to use the materials efficiently and effectively.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our overall math achievement proficiency will increase from 50% to 65% as measured by the FAST state assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring and district Benchmark testing. We will also use Common Formative Assessments and Acaletics Scrimmages to monitor progress in math. Additionally, the grade level teams will use assessments aligned to standards and use district created assessments to analyze effectiveness of instructional practices.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Krista Francies (franciesk@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Collaborative planning and PLCs will be used to increase the collective teacher efficacy. Collective teacher efficacy has a Hattie Effect size of 1.57. 6400-120, \$19,500 for year long collaborative planning to support this goal. The instructional coach and interventionists paid through Title 1 support this process and teacher learning. Additionally, they help to monitor student learning as a result of these activities.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Improving instruction in the classroom will happen when teachers have the knowledge, skills and attitudes to reflect on instruction and improve learning for students. Clarity of instruction is a focus to provide students with highly effective instruction to close gaps.

**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.

1. PLC Professional Learning will be provided by the principal.
2. Follow up support in teams to identify Benchmarks, Focus on student need, select evidence based practices will be done by the administrative team with all teams.
3. Data Cycles will be completed to monitor effectiveness of strategies. (Admin and team leaders)
4. Classroom observations of the strategies taught, feedback in coaching cycles and modeling of what is expected by coach and administration will be conducted.



5. Follow up differentiated professional learning will be provided to teachers upon need identified through triangulated data.

**Person Responsible**     Natalie Jadid (jadidn@manateeschools.net)

**#3. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.**

The data indicates that our students with disabilities have not made similar growth as our other subgroups. The growth with this group has remained stagnant since 2019 in ELA and Math.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Students with disabilities will increase proficiency in ELA from 15 to 30 % and increase from 24 to 40% in Math as measured on the state assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through common formative assessments, state-wide progress monitoring and district benchmarks.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Natalie Jadid (jadidn@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Data driven decision making will be used to focus on this group targeting their needs and providing instruction that meets their specific need.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

This group of students have learning challenges and will require a high level of intervention to succeed. Monitoring this group on a weekly basis will help teams adjust and change course as needed.

**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.

1. PLC Professional Learning will be provided by the principal. 6400-120, \$19,500 for year long collaborative planning to support this goal.
2. Follow up support in teams to identify Benchmarks, Focus on SWD, select evidence based practices will be done by the administrative team with all teams.
3. Data Cycles will be completed to monitor effectiveness of strategies. (Admin and team leaders)

**Person Responsible**

Krista Francies (franciesk@manateeschools.net)

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**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**

Tier 1 instruction will be on grade level and standards aligned. Small group instruction will be provided. Explicit, systematic and multisensory instruction for early literacy is provided daily for all levels. Tier 2 instruction will be provided in small groups for students to target foundations skills. Tier 3 instruction will be provided to assist students in with reading deficits in small groups. Progress monitoring will be frequent and instruction will be adjusted based on need.

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

Tier 1 instruction will be on grade level and standards aligned. Small group instruction will be provided to scaffold learning. Explicit, systematic and multisensory instruction in the areas of vocabulary, comprehension and writing in grade level texts. Tier 2 instruction will be provided in small groups for students to target comprehension skills. Tier 3 instruction will be provided to assist students in with reading deficits in small groups. Progress monitoring will be frequent and instruction will be adjusted based on need.

**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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By May 2023, 50% of students in K-2 will score proficiency in ELA as measured by state progress monitoring assessments aligned to expected student benchmark outcomes.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By May 2023, 50% of students in 3-5 will score proficiency in ELA as measured by state progress monitoring assessments aligned to expected student benchmark outcomes.

**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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

FAST Progress Monitoring, Common Formative Assessments, and progress monitoring of Tier 2 and Tier 3 will be done to analyze and reflect on instructional practices and students needs. Schoolwide instructional practices will be monitored through the review of collaborative planning notes, lesson plans, and grade level instructional alignment of standards, tasks, and assignments through formative assessment practices in reading and writing that meet grade level benchmark expectations. The administration will participate in regularly scheduled walkthroughs to monitor instructional transfer from lesson planning through implementation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jadid, Natalie, jadidn@manateeschools.net

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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. Â§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?

Data driven decision making will be used to adjust learning paths to accelerate learning for students frequently using the data sets described. Grade-level teams will plan collaboratively using a consistent planning protocol that supports instructional alignment. Teachers will use district-provided materials of Benchmark Advance for CORE reading and writing instruction aligned to the BEST standards. Tiered intervention support will be provided using guided reading materials, and additional programs will be used to provide direct and explicit systematic instruction for more intense interventions. All learning will be progress-monitored through DIBELS for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions, and CORE instruction will be monitored through writing formative assessments and unit assessments aligned to the grade level benchmarks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The identified practices will address the literacy needs of students on a regular basis as data is tracked and analyzed regularly to improve instruction and outcomes.

**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
-------------	-----------------------------------

All action steps for the BEST implementation Area of Focus apply to the RAISE Area of Focus. Implement grade-level collaborative planning. Provide professional development for Benchmark Advance, MTSS - A, FAST, running records, and the new writing rubrics. Provide ongoing coaching based upon student data, classroom observations, and teacher evaluation. School leadership will ensure the implementation of district curriculum/pacing guides and assessment calendars. Literacy Leadership-The team will meet monthly to analyze data for trends and needs. Literacy Coaching- Coaching Cycles will be provided and facilitation of collaborative planning. Assessment-PLCs and data analysis will be done weekly to improve teaching practices. Professional Learning-PL will be provided based on observed needs and data analysis. Participate in and implement the professional development provided by the State Regional Literacy Directors to improve early literacy instruction. Implement the Decision-Trees from the Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan for reading intervention instruction. Participate in and implement the HIITS "Learning to Read" coaching professional development plan

Jadid, Natalie,  
jadidn@manateeschools.net

**Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

The school has instituted an MTSS-B system to monitor and intervene for students whose behavior is negatively impacting achievement. Each grade level team monitors grade level discipline data and identifies

students for whom Tier 1 behavior management and discipline strategies are not working. These students are identified for MTSS-B focus by the ILT and the MTSS facilitator. The MTSS team meets weekly to review Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior strategies and make decisions to support students. The school employs a CHAMPS and PBIS model in which students' positive behavior is rewarded and recognized. There is a positive behavior referral initiative to highlight students whose behavior is successful. The school will implement professional development for teachers to enhance their Tier 1 behavior and classroom management skills to further build positive school culture and environment.

**Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.**

Grade level teams-review grade level discipline data and refer students to MTSS-B ILT-reviews school-wide discipline data to determine Tier 2 and 3 interventions for students. The administrative team monitors the positive school culture through observations, and data analysis to provide wrap around services.