

Manatee County Public Schools

ANNA MARIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2024-25 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 3

 A. School Mission and Vision 3

 B. School Leadership Team 3

 C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring 6

 D. Demographic Data 7

 E. Early Warning Systems 8

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 11

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 16

 E. Grade Level Data Review 19

III. Planning for Improvement 20

IV. Positive Culture and Environment 28

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 30

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 32

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 33

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Manatee County School Board on Original date for School Board approval 10/8/24 - Rescheduled due to Hurricane. School Board approved 10/22/24.

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) |
| <p>A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 parents), 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://cims2.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) | |
| I.E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II.A-E: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| III.A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III.B, IV: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| V: 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. The printed version in CIMS represents the SIP as of the "Printed" date listed in the footer.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Growing together as we plant seeds to learn, dream and succeed. We strive to support student experiences that will provide them the tools to be successful individuals and members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement

At Anna Maria Elementary, our vision is to become a community of learners that celebrates our differences and embraces our future.

B. School Leadership Team

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Dr. Katie Fradley

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Serves as curriculum leader

a. Serves on the School Data Team

b. Coordinate activities with team members to facilitate the implementation of content area performance standards, instructional objectives and interdisciplinary planning units

c. Oversees District and State Assessment processes

d. MTSS Team member, ILT Chair, Literacy Leadership Team member

e. Oversees, coordinates, and monitors the implementation of best practices for inclusive education for all SWDs

f. Provides support for students and parents in all aspects of the school environment to promote a positive

school environment and academic achievement

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Kim Sherberne

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- a. Serve as Data Team Member
- b. 504 coordinator
- c. IST/MTSS Coordinator
- d. Testing Coordinator
- e. Guidance Counselor

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Dr. Laura Redeker

Position Title

School Support Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- a. Discipline
- b. Chairs Threat Assessment Committee
- c. Serves on MTSS/ILT Team
- d. Provides academic intervention K-5

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Stephanie Davis

Position Title

5th Grade Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- a. 5th Grade Teacher
- b. Serves on the Instructional Leadership Team Literacy Leadership Team Model Classroom Teacher 3-5
- c. 3rd-5th Team Leader
- d. Oversees Acaletics Grades 2-5

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Pamela Buff

Position Title

3rd Grade Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- a. 3rd Grade Teacher and serves on the Instructional Leadership Team
- b. BEST Standards ELA Champion
- c. Literacy Leadership Team

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Nicole O'Neill

Position Title

4th Grade Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- a. Fourth Grade Teacher
- b. Serves on the Instructional Leadership Team
- c. BEST Standards Math Champion/Trainer
- d. Serves on Threat Management Committee

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Michelle Costanzo

Position Title

Second Grade Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

- a. 2nd Grade Teacher and serves on the Instructional Leadership Team
- b. Literacy Leadership Team
- c. Team Leader K-2

C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(2))

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

The School Improvement Plan Committee is comprised of members of the Instructional Leadership Team. This team provides input with preliminary SIP draft. The draft SIP is presented to staff and the School Advisory Council for additional input/changes.

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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESEA 1114(b)(3))

The Instructional Leadership Team will meet monthly to review student progress monitoring data for students identified as needing Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention in ELA, Math, Behavior or Attendance. The Teacher Collaborative Team will meet with grade level teachers monthly to review school level and state level progress monitoring data to inform decisions around effective interventions for students.

D. Demographic Data

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2024-25 STATUS (PER MSID FILE) | ACTIVE |
| SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE) | ELEMENTARY KG-5 |
| PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE) | K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION |
| 2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS | NO |
| 2023-24 MINORITY RATE | 16.9% |
| 2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE | 39.0% |
| CHARTER SCHOOL | NO |
| RAISE SCHOOL | NO |
| 2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024 | N/A |
| ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG) | |
| 2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK) | STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL) |
| SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i> | 2023-24: A 2022-23: A* 2021-22: A 2020-21: 2019-20: |

E. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2024-25

Using 2023-24 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 school days | 3 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 8 | | | | 33 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 4 | 17 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 2 | | | | 38 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 11 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 4 | | | | 41 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | 2 | 12 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | 27 |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4) | | | | | | | | | | 0 |

Current Year 2024-25

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 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 4 | | | | 15 |

Current Year 2024-25

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

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained students: current year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | 0 |

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last 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 school days | | 7 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 2 | | | | 25 |
| One or more suspensions | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | | 5 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 7 | | | | 29 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | | 9 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 5 | | | | 26 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | | 4 | 6 | 9 | | | | | | 27 |

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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 | | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | | | | 15 |

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

| INDICATOR | GRADE LEVEL | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained students: current year | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | | | | | | | | | | 0 |

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

| ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT | 2024 | | | 2023 | | | 2022** | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|
| | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† |
| ELA Achievement * | 79 | 55 | 57 | 74 | 51 | 53 | 78 | 55 | 56 |
| ELA Grade 3 Achievement ** | 77 | 55 | 58 | 76 | 51 | 53 | | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 76 | 60 | 60 | | | | 66 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25% | 58 | 58 | 57 | | | | 43 | | |
| Math Achievement * | 82 | 66 | 62 | 81 | 62 | 59 | 78 | 50 | 50 |
| Math Learning Gains | 70 | 63 | 62 | | | | 81 | | |
| Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% | 58 | 51 | 52 | | | | 64 | | |
| Science Achievement * | 74 | 54 | 57 | 72 | 51 | 54 | 85 | 65 | 59 |
| Social Studies Achievement * | | | | | | | | 66 | 64 |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | | | 52 | 50 |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | | | 51 | 52 |
| College and Career Readiness | | | | | | | | | 80 |
| ELP Progress | 61 | 61 | | | 59 | 59 | | | |

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2023-24 ESSA FPPI | |
|----------------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL FPPI – All Students | 72% |
| OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the FPPI | 574 |
| Total Components for the FPPI | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Graduation Rate | |

| ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|
| 2023-24 | 2022-23 | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20* | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| 72% | 76% | 71% | 70% | | 66% | 61% |

* Pursuant to Florida Department of Education Emergency Order No. 2020-EO-1 (PDF), spring K-12 statewide assessment test administrations for the 2019-20 school year were canceled and accountability measures reliant on such data were not calculated for the 2019-20 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 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% |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Students With Disabilities | 58% | No | | |
| White Students | 69% | No | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 72% | No | | |

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% |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Students With Disabilities | 59% | No | | |
| White Students | 72% | No | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 68% | No | | |

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% |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Students With Disabilities | 38% | Yes | 1 | |
| English Language Learners | | | | |
| Native American Students | | | | |
| Asian Students | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | | | | |
| Multiracial Students | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | |
| White Students | 70% | No | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 70% | No | | |

D. 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)

| 2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. | GRAD RATE 2022-23 | C&C ACCEL 2022-23 | ELP PROGRESS |
| All Students | 79% | 77% | 76% | 58% | 82% | 70% | 58% | 74% | | | | | |
| Students With Disabilities | 70% | 70% | 55% | | 60% | 36% | | | | | | | |
| White Students | 75% | 73% | 74% | 58% | 82% | 65% | 58% | 70% | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 67% | 73% | 74% | | 70% | 79% | | 69% | | | | | |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. |
| All Students | 74% | 76% | | | 81% | | | 72% | | |
| Students With Disabilities | 61% | | | | 56% | | | | | |
| White Students | 71% | 69% | | | 78% | | | 71% | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 67% | | | | 73% | | | 64% | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 ELA ACH. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | MATH ACH. | MATH LG | MATH LG L25% | SCI ACH. | SS ACH. | MS ACCEL. |
| All Students | 78% | | 66% | 43% | 78% | 81% | 64% | 85% | | |
| Students With Disabilities | 42% | | | | 33% | | | | | |
| English Language Learners | | | | | | | | | | |
| Native American Students | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian Students | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic Students | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multiracial Students | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pacific Islander Students | | | | | | | | | | |
| White Students | 77% | | 67% | 46% | 78% | 79% | 58% | 83% | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 71% | | 67% | | 65% | 78% | | | | |

E. 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.

| 2023-24 SPRING | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|--------|----------|-------------------|-------|----------------|
| SUBJECT | GRADE | SCHOOL | DISTRICT | SCHOOL - DISTRICT | STATE | SCHOOL - STATE |
| Ela | 3 | 77% | 51% | 26% | 55% | 22% |
| Ela | 4 | 84% | 52% | 32% | 53% | 31% |
| Ela | 5 | 78% | 51% | 27% | 55% | 23% |
| Math | 3 | 74% | 63% | 11% | 60% | 14% |
| Math | 4 | 89% | 62% | 27% | 58% | 31% |
| Math | 5 | 86% | 60% | 26% | 56% | 30% |
| Science | 5 | 72% | 49% | 23% | 53% | 19% |

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

ELA proficiency increased overall from 75% to 79%. Fourth grade made the most growth from 63% to 84%. The 2024 4th grade class was made up of just one class of 19 students and a veteran teacher who used district curriculum and taught to the rigor of the standards. The small class size allowed the teacher and support team to personalize instruction and data analysis. For instance after a thorough analysis of 2023 FAST PM 3 data which indicated that students were performing below grade level on poetry as well as with informational text, the teacher adjusted instruction to focus on both of these areas.

Lowest Performance

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

Learning Gains with L25 students in both Reading and Math were the lowest performance area. Last year's school grade was only based on achievement so comparisons cannot be drawn.

Greatest Decline

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

All of the Achievement categories increased.

ELA: 75 to 79

MATH: 79 to 82

SCIENCE: 72

Greatest Gap

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.

There were no data components that were below the state average.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

After examining EWS Data the biggest concern is the large number of 1st grade students with a

Substantial Reading Deficiency. Additionally of further concern is the number of first grade students who performed at a level 1 on FSA Math.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Decrease the regression and increase Learning Gains for ELA L25 students in grades 3-5.
2. Decrease the regression and Increase Learning Gains for MATH L25 students in grades 3-5.
3. Decrease the number of First Graders with a Substantial Reading Deficiency.
4. Decrease number of First Graders with a Substantial Math Deficiency.

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning, ELA, Math, Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Only 58% of L25 students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in ELA and Math during the 2023-2024 school year. Three level 1 students stayed at Level 1. An examination of the district's Pivot Tables showed 6 students who regressed in the scores. Additional supports are needed to support these students.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

If Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then we will increase L25 learning gains to 75% as measured by 2025 Spring FAST. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning using Mission Critical Funds; (2) Regular classroom observations by principal with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) PLC's that examine the root cause by focusing not only on what we teach and what we assess, but what we do when students are successful vs. what we do when they are not successful. These PLC's will be facilitated by the principal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Dr. Katie Fradley, Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

We will implement grade level PLC's with a focus on addressing 4 questions: What do we expect students to learn? How do we know they are learning? How do we respond when they don't learn? How do we respond when they have already learned?

Rationale:

PLC's that focus on the root cause will allow us to closely examine our practice and to stay focused on each of our L25 students and how their response to tiered support impacts our instructional decisions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of what students must know, understand, and be able to do aligned to the rigor required of the benchmarks and to plan instructional task that engage all students. Weekly collaborative planning will also address remedial and accelerated instruction for small groups and provide opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data.

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Katie Fradley, Principal

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Weekly Collaborative planning sessions monitored by principal.

Action Step #2

Monthly grade level PLC's with principal to analyze current data and to address what is working and what is not working and next steps.

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Katie Fradley, Principal

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

We will implement grade level PLC's with a focus on addressing 4 questions: What do we expect students to learn? How do we know they are learning? How do we respond when they don't learn? How do we respond when they have already learned? The principal will monitor this action by facilitating the PLC's.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

One area of focus during the 2024-2025 school year will be ELA. A focus on this area will decrease the number of students K-5 with a Substantial Reading Deficiency. This area of focus was selected after reviewing prior data which showed a trend in the number of students leaving kindergarten and first grade with a substantial reading deficiency. Specifically during the 2023-2024 school year 11 Kindergarten students and 11 first grade students are entering the next grade level with a substantial reading deficiency.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

During the 2023-2024 school year 59% of first grade students at Anna Maria Elementary were proficient as measured by the STAR Reading Assessment. During the 2024-2025 school year 80% of students in grades K-5 at Anna Maria Elementary will be proficient in ELA as measured the the FAST PM3.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

If Tier I instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then we will increase proficiency. Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) Regular team meetings, such as ILT, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Dr. Katie Fradley, Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Weekly collaborative planning sessions will be held with K and I teachers.

Rationale:

Weekly collaborative planning sessions will ensure the fidelity of tier one instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Examine the effectiveness of current small group Tier 2 instruction in ELA in K/1 to ensure that district adopted materials are being used to fidelity. Provide district support/PD on Intandem.

Rationale:

If district approved materials are being used to fidelity students should be making academic progress towards grade level expectations.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #3:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention.

Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

District training and support on The Science of Reading as well as district adopted materials such as "In Tandem" to support small group instruction in K/1.

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Fradley

By When/Frequency:

monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The principal will be responsible for arranging PD support from the curriculum team monthly in person or virtually.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

No Answer Entered

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

No Answer Entered

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

No Answer Entered

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Area of Focus #4

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

No Answer Entered

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

No Answer Entered

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

No Answer Entered

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

IV. Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus #1

Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Our present enrollment has declined and is currently 164 students. Our school has the capacity for up to 291 students. Currently our zone has become a vacation rental community. This makes it necessary for us to recruit students from out of our zone to attend our unique school.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Our goal is to increase choice enrollment by 10% in grades K-5 during the school year as measured by controlled open enrollment.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This area of focus will be monitored by the principal Dr. Fradley with the support of Darlene Black and Jamara Clark.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Dr. Katie Fradley

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Increase marketing , advertising and recruitment efforts.

Rationale:

Through increased marketing and recruitment more families will choose to attend Anna Maria utilizing controlled open enrollment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Meet with district leaders to discuss ideas on increasing enrollment such as: increased social media presence, adding EDP before care program, adding a bus hub, looking at magnet school grants which would support transportation to the school from other parts of the county, increased on site tours, step by step directions on Controlled Open Enrollment to make the process easier for parents, on site conservation/science centered field trips for other schools to attend on AME campus using natural resources such as access to ocean, the teaching and learning deck and dock.

Rationale:

The school has a unique opportunity to attract students to Manatee County through its physical location on the water and the many resources that brings.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Dr. Fradley meet with Jamara Clark, Director of Student Demographics and School Choice.

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Katie Fradley

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Dr. Fradley will meet with Mr. Clark during the first month of school to begin strategizing and will have ongoing meetings throughout the school year.

Action Step #2

Dr. Fradley will offer onsite tours weekly and have a strong social media presence as well as in the local Island Newspaper.

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Katie Fradley

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Weekly Facebook posts and Weekly Stories in The Islander.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available. (ESEA 1116(b-g))

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP. (ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)ii))

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

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). (ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4))

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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 ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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. (ESEA section 11149b)(7)(iii(V)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

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

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s), rationale (i.e., data) and plan to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2024-25 UniSIG funds but has chosen not to apply.

No

| BUDGET | ACTIVITY | FUNCTION/ OBJECT | FUNDING SOURCE | FTE | AMOUNT |
|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|-----|--------|
| Plan Budget Total | | | | | 0.00 |