Brevard Public Schools

MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2026-27 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 2

A. School Mission and Vision 2

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2

C. Demographic Data 8

D. Early Warning Systems 9

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 13

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 14

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 15

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 16

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 17

E. Grade Level Data Review 20

III. Planning for Improvement 21

IV. Positive Learning Environment 38

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 41

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 44

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 45

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state’s graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The Manatee Elementary School community will design quality learning experiences; fostering an environment of high academic and character standards. (Revised 11/2025)

Provide the school's vision statement

The Manatee Elementary School community strives to create a nurturing environment which will empower students to meet the challenges of the future. (Revised 11/2025)

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

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

Shannon Daly

daly.shannon@brevardschools.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mrs. Daly serves as the lead instructional leader, responsible for creating and sustaining a culture of high expectations and continuous academic growth. In partnership with staff, families, and district personnel, she drives instructional improvement by ensuring rigorous, standards-based teaching and learning for all students in alignment with the mission and goals of Brevard Public Schools.

• Lead the development and implementation of a clear instructional vision grounded in data, equity, and high expectations for all learners.

• Align all instructional practices with the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards and Brevard Public Schools’

curriculum frameworks.
• Foster a professional learning culture where continuous improvement in teaching and learning is expected and supported.
• Regularly observe classrooms and provide actionable, give feedback to teachers to support high-quality instruction.
• Develop and implement a schoolwide professional development plan that meets the learning needs of staff and reflects school improvement goals.
• Lead the analysis and use of school, grade-level, and classroom assessment data to identify trends, monitor student progress, and drive instructional decisions.
• Facilitate the leadership team to execute data chats with teachers to align instructional planning with student needs.
• Monitor the effectiveness of interventions and enrichment opportunities within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).
• Ensure the consistent and effective use of district-adopted curriculum materials and evidence-based instructional strategies.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name
Courtney Shiffrin

shiffrin.courtney@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

• Support the implementation of district-adopted curricula and instructional frameworks across all grade levels.
• Collaborate with teachers to develop and implement high-impact instructional strategies aligned with Florida B.E.S.T. Standards.
• Conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide actionable, feedback to improve instructional quality.
• Assist in developing schoolwide instructional goals and monitor progress toward continuous improvement.
• Plan, deliver, and facilitate professional development activities to enhance instructional practices, including differentiated instruction, assessment literacy, and data-driven planning.
• Coach and mentor teachers through cycles of continuous improvement, supporting both new and veteran educators.
• Lead professional learning communities (PLCs) with a focus on collaborative planning, standards-based instruction, and student data analysis.
• Assist in organizing and overseeing progress monitoring and other schoolwide assessment efforts.

• Analyze school, grade-level, and classroom-level academic data to identify trends, strengths, and areas for growth.
• Support instructional practices that meet the needs of diverse learners, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and gifted students.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Ilea Trahan

trahan.ilea@brevardschools.org

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

• Support the implementation of district-adopted curricula and instructional frameworks across all grade levels.
• Collaborate with teachers to develop and implement high-impact instructional strategies aligned with Florida B.E.S.T. Standards.
• Conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide actionable, feedback to improve instructional quality.
• Assist in developing schoolwide instructional goals and monitor progress toward continuous improvement.
• Plan, deliver, and facilitate professional development activities to enhance instructional practices, including differentiated instruction, assessment literacy, and data-driven planning.
• Coach and mentor teachers through cycles of continuous improvement, supporting both new and veteran educators.
• Lead professional learning communities (PLCs) with a focus on collaborative planning, standards-based instruction, and student data analysis.
• Assist in organizing and overseeing progress monitoring and other schoolwide assessment efforts.
• Analyze school, grade-level, and classroom-level academic data to identify trends, strengths, and areas for growth.
• Support instructional practices that meet the needs of diverse learners, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and gifted students.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Staci Worden

wordent.staci@brevardschools.org

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Manatee Instructional Coach is a non-evaluative, instructional leadership position designed to strengthen classroom teaching and enhance student learning. Staci Worden partners with teachers, grade-level teams, and school leadership to support the implementation of high-quality, standards-aligned instruction. This role focuses on job-embedded professional development, modeling, and collaborative planning to promote instructional excellence across all grade levels.
• The Instructional Coach collaborates with teachers (with a focus on new and teachers needing support) through coaching cycles that include co-planning, modeling lessons, observing instruction, and providing feedback to enhance teaching practices.
• Support the implementation of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards and district-adopted instructional frameworks.
• Promote evidence-based instructional strategies that meet the needs of all learners, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and advanced learners.
• Design and deliver high-impact, school-based professional development aligned to school improvement goals and district priorities to be delivered in weekly PLC meeting, Friday PD and on demand PD.
• Facilitate Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focused on data-driven planning, standards alignment, and instructional best practices.
• Serve as a resource for integrating, literacy strategies, and content-specific pedagogy into daily instruction.
• Support teachers in unpacking standards, planning rigorous lessons, and using district- provided curricular materials with fidelity.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name
Rita Gleason

gleason.rita@brevardschools.org

Position Title
ESE Support Specalist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Manatee Instructional Coach is a non-evaluative, instructional leadership position designed to strengthen classroom teaching and enhance student learning. Staci Worden partners with teachers, grade-level teams, and school leadership to support the implementation of high-quality, standards-aligned instruction. This role focuses on job-embedded professional development, modeling, and collaborative planning to promote instructional excellence across all grade levels.

• The Instructional Coach collaborates with teachers (with a focus on new and teachers needing support) through coaching cycles that include co-planning, modeling lessons, observing instruction, and providing feedback to enhance teaching practices.
• Support the implementation of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards and district-adopted instructional frameworks.
• Promote evidence-based instructional strategies that meet the needs of all learners, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and advanced learners.
• Design and deliver high-impact, school-based professional development aligned to school improvement goals and district priorities to be delivered in weekly PLC meeting, Friday PD and on demand PD.
• Facilitate Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focused on data-driven planning, standards alignment, and instructional best practices.
• Serve as a resource for integrating, literacy strategies, and content-specific pedagogy into daily instruction.
• Support teachers in unpacking standards, planning rigorous lessons, and using district- provided curricular materials with fidelity.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

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

Stakeholders include our students, families, instructional staff members, support staff, school advisory council, PTO, and our community at large. Feedback is sought from all groups and data are closely reviewed and analyzed to set new goals for improvement. Google surveys are a quick way to gather small amounts of information to be able to utilize immediately and move forward with goals with input from those that initiatives affect. Manatee administration takes time to look closely and reflect on commentary received from all our surveys. Surveys are created as necessary to gather feedback. This creates a sense of trust and commitment among leadership and our stakeholders.

3. 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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is developed and introduced by the leadership team based on data. Teacher goals align with the SIP, creating a unified approach to school improvement, and teachers support students in setting short-term achievement goals. Progress is reviewed quarterly with staff and SAC to guide instruction and decision-making.

Ongoing classroom walkthroughs, observations, and formative assessments identify strengths and areas for growth, while FOCUS data tracks culture goals. To support BPIE indicators, Manatee will collaborate with a full-time Support Specialist to ensure students with disabilities are appropriately included with their peers. Implementation is monitored through walkthroughs and PLC discussions, with progress shared quarterly at faculty and SAC meetings.

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	**ACTIVE**
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	**ELEMENTARY** **PK-6**
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	**K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION**
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**21.2%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**NO**
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	**N/A**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2025-26 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.*	**2025-26: A** **2024-25: A** **2023-24: A** **2022-23: A** **2021-22: A**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2026-27

Using 2025-26 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	
School Enrollment	112	120	120	161	130	146	141			930
Absent 10% or more school days	14	11	6	9	12	6	8			66
One or more suspensions	7	5	4	5	1	2	5			29
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	1	0	0			2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	1			4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	8	13	3			38
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	5	11	2			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	9	4	19	1	7	0			44
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0

Current Year 2026-27

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	4	5	1	6	3	3	3			25

Current Year 2026-27

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	2	5	2	5	2	0	0			16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0			1

Prior Year (2025-26) 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	
School Enrollment	112	122	123	156	138	145	140			936
Absent 10% or more school days	3	15	12	12	8	10	7			67
One or more suspensions	3	7	3	5	1	4	5			28
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)				1	1					2
Course failure in Math					1	3	1			5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	12	13	18	6	9	12			72
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	2	9	11	13	3	12	11			61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Prior Year (2025-26) 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	2	8	3	4	2	5	2			26

Prior Year (2025-26) 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	3	4	4	4	1					16
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

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 2025-26 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026			2025			2024		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	85	65	62	82	62	59	83	61	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	83	63	61	81	58	59	81	59	58
ELA Learning Gains	79	67	63	68	62	60	70	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67	61	58	62	57	56	67	60	57
Math Achievement*	87	66	66	86	63	64	89	62	62
Math Learning Gains	79	68	64	75	67	63	85	68	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69	55	50	59	54	51	81	59	52
Science Achievement	87	66	62	84	62	58	84	60	57
Social Studies Achievement*			95			92			
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)					62	63		57	61

*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)

2025-26 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	80%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	636
Total Components for the FPPI	8
Percent Tested	99%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
80%	75%	81%	82%	81%	73%	

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2025-26 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	67%	No		
English Language Learners	71%	No		
Asian Students	81%	No		
Black/African American Students	70%	No		
Hispanic Students	81%	No		
Multiracial Students	84%	No		
White Students	80%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	66%	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.

2025-26 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 2024-25	C&C ACCEL 2024-25	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	85%	83%	79%	67%	87%	79%	69%	87%					
Students With Disabilities	58%	55%	76%	70%	67%	76%	70%	60%					
English Language Learners	58%				83%								
Asian Students	84%		86%		84%	71%							
Black/African American Students	74%		79%	77%	71%	75%	50%	64%					
Hispanic Students	85%	88%	73%		85%	83%	69%	87%					
Multiracial Students	85%	80%	78%		87%	74%		100%					
White Students	86%	81%	80%	66%	89%	79%	73%	89%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	68%	64%	77%	68%	69%	62%	50%	66%					

2024-25 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 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	82%	81%	68%	62%	86%	75%	59%	84%					75%
Students With Disabilities	50%	53%	52%	42%	56%	54%	47%	67%					
English Language Learners													75%
Asian Students	82%		79%		88%	79%							
Black/African American Students	59%		82%		70%	71%							
Hispanic Students	87%	92%	73%		85%	70%	40%	80%					
Multiracial Students	80%		56%		86%	60%							
White Students	83%	82%	67%	62%	87%	77%	63%	88%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	62%	75%	50%	48%	68%	67%	52%	67%					

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	83%	81%	70%	67%	89%	85%	81%	84%					90%
Students With Disabilities	45%	48%	62%	57%	59%	77%	74%	35%					
English Language Learners	69%		45%		85%	91%							90%
Asian Students	88%		67%		94%	93%							
Black/African American Students	76%		59%		76%	82%							
Hispanic Students	84%		69%	80%	92%	92%	100%	89%					
Multiracial Students	83%	90%	71%		95%	93%		83%					
White Students	83%	82%	70%	67%	89%	83%	79%	85%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	72%	69%	62%	53%	82%	79%	73%	64%					

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.

		2025-26 SPRING				
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	82%	63%	19%	60%	22%
ELA	4	85%	61%	24%	60%	25%
ELA	5	80%	62%	18%	61%	19%
ELA	6	91%	74%	17%	62%	29%
Math	3	84%	66%	18%	66%	18%
Math	4	89%	62%	27%	65%	24%
Math	5	78%	58%	20%	62%	16%
Math	6	97%	74%	23%	60%	37%
Science	5	86%	64%	22%	60%	26%
Algebra	6	** data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.*				

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 overall learning gains demonstrated the most significant improvement, increasing by 12 percentage points to 80%. This growth reflects a strong, schoolwide focus on progress monitoring, targeted intervention, and consistent instructional practices. To drive improvement in ELA learning gains, our school implemented several strategic actions focused on strengthening instructional systems, increasing accountability, and ensuring timely, data-informed decision-making.

Revamped Intervention Block: We redesigned our intervention time to ensure it is structured, protected, and aligned to student needs. Instruction during this block is differentiated based on data, with targeted small-group support for students needing to achieve learning gains or improve proficiency levels.

Schoolwide OPM (Ongoing Progress Monitoring) Cycles: We implemented consistent, schoolwide OPM cycles to track student progress in real time. These cycles allowed teachers to quickly identify skill gaps and adjust instruction accordingly, ensuring that interventions remained targeted and effective.

Increased Instructional Expectations and Accountability: Clear expectations for high-quality instruction were established and consistently monitored. Administrators and instructional coaches conducted frequent walkthroughs and provided feedback to ensure fidelity of implementation across all classrooms.

Data Chats Every Six Weeks: Structured data conversations were held every six weeks with teachers and instructional teams. During these meetings, staff analyzed student performance data, identified trends, grouped students based on need, and created actionable plans for instruction and intervention.

Streamlined and Intentional Use of Instructional Resources: Instructional materials were carefully vetted to ensure alignment with standards and effectiveness. This minimized variability in resources and ensured all teachers were using high-quality, research-based materials to support ELA

instruction.

Targeted Reteach Plan Following PM2: After PM2, we developed and implemented a structured, schoolwide reteach plan. Teachers used assessment data to focus on priority standards and provide explicit, targeted reteaching to address identified skill deficits

Student Identification and Goal Alignment: Following PM2, we identified specific students who needed to either increase their achievement level or demonstrate a learning gain in order to meet school goals. These students were prioritized for targeted interventions, progress monitoring, and frequent review of their instructional plans

Lowest Performance

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

Manatee Elementary experienced the lowest performance in Math learning gains for the Lowest 25%, which declined significantly in 2025 from 81% to 59%. In 2026, the school began to rebound, showing a modest 4-point increase to 63%; however, this subgroup remains an area of focused need.

Inconsistent Tier 1 Instruction in Mathematics: Variability in core math instruction across classrooms led to gaps in student understanding, particularly for foundational skills. The absence of consistent use of explicit instruction (I Do, We Do, You Do) impacted students who rely heavily on structured, scaffolded support.

Lack of Targeted Small Group Differentiation: While intervention structures were in place, there was inconsistent implementation of differentiated small group instruction during the core math block. Students in the Lowest 25% did not consistently receive the targeted, skill-based support needed to accelerate growth.

Gaps in Foundational Skills: Data trends indicated that many students in this subgroup had significant gaps in prerequisite skills, particularly in number sense and problem-solving strategies. These gaps made it difficult for students to access grade-level content, leading to stalled progress.

Delayed or Limited Response to Data: Prior to refining our OPM cycles, there were delays in identifying struggling students and adjusting instruction. Progress monitoring practices lacked consistency, resulting in missed opportunities for immediate intervention.

Instructional Resource Misalignment: Variability in the use of instructional resources and insufficient vetting led to inconsistencies in rigor and alignment to standards. This impacted the quality of

instruction students received, particularly in addressing priority benchmarks.

Insufficient Structured Reteach Opportunities: Unlike ELA, there was not a clearly defined, schoolwide reteach plan in math following progress monitoring checkpoints. This limited the ability to systematically address misconceptions and reteach essential standards.

Reduced Focus on the Lowest 25% Subgroup: While attention was given to overall proficiency, there was less intentional tracking, monitoring, and goal-setting specifically for the Lowest 25%. This contributed to gaps in targeted intervention and accountability.

Student Engagement and Mathematical Confidence: Trends suggested that students in this subgroup demonstrated lower confidence and persistence in math tasks. Limited opportunities for guided practice and success experiences contributed to reduced engagement.

Greatest Decline

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

Several key factors contributed to the decline in Math learning gains for the Lowest 25%, along with identifiable trends that are guiding our current improvement efforts:

Inconsistent Tier 1 Instruction in Mathematics: Variability in core math instruction across classrooms led to gaps in student understanding, particularly for foundational skills. The absence of consistent use of explicit instruction (I Do, We Do, You Do) impacted students who rely heavily on structured, scaffolded support.

Lack of Targeted Small Group Differentiation: While intervention structures were in place, there was inconsistent implementation of differentiated small group instruction during the core math block. Students in the Lowest 25% did not consistently receive the targeted, skill-based support needed to accelerate growth.

Gaps in Foundational Skills: Data trends indicated that many students in this subgroup had significant gaps in prerequisite skills, particularly in number sense and problem-solving strategies. These gaps made it difficult for students to access grade-level content, leading to stalled progress.

Delayed or Limited Response to Data: Prior to refining our OPM cycles, there were delays in identifying struggling students and adjusting instruction. Progress monitoring practices lacked consistency, resulting in missed opportunities for immediate intervention.

Instructional Resource Misalignment: Variability in the use of instructional resources and insufficient vetting led to inconsistencies in rigor and alignment to standards. This impacted the quality of instruction students received, particularly in addressing priority benchmarks.

Insufficient Structured Reteach Opportunities: Unlike ELA, there was not a clearly defined, schoolwide reteach plan in math following progress monitoring checkpoints. This limited the ability to systematically address misconceptions and reteach essential standards.

Reduced Focus on the Lowest 25% Subgroup: While attention was given to overall proficiency, there was less intentional tracking, monitoring, and goal-setting specifically for the Lowest 25%. This contributed to gaps in targeted intervention and accountability.

Student Engagement and Mathematical Confidence: Trends suggested that students in this subgroup demonstrated lower confidence and persistence in math tasks. Limited opportunities for guided practice and success experiences contributed to reduced engagement.

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.

Manatee Elementary consistently scores above the state average in all areas.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

There are 29 students with one or more suspensions, with representation across all grade levels, particularly in Kindergarten (7), 3rd grade (5), and 6th grade (5).

Behavioral incidents resulting in suspensions reduce instructional time and negatively impact student achievement.
Trend Insight: The presence of suspensions even in early grades suggests a need for stronger Tier 1 behavior supports and proactive intervention systems.
Implication: Addressing behavior is essential to improving both academic outcomes and overall school climate.

Highest Priorities

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

Improving math learning gains for the Lowest 25% remains the school’s top priority. Although a slight rebound was observed, this subgroup continues to underperform and requires intensive, targeted support.

While overall ELA gains improved, continued focus on the Lowest 25% is essential to sustain and extend progress.

Science achievement remains an area for growth as the school works to improve proficiency levels and strengthen content mastery.

Reducing behavior referrals among ESE students is a key priority to ensure increased access to instruction and a positive learning environment.

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 ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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.

For students performing in the lowest 25% of achievement in ELA across the relevant grade levels, instruction will focus on strengthening foundational literacy skills through explicit, systematic, and data-driven teaching practices. Instruction will include direct modeling, guided practice, immediate corrective feedback, frequent progress monitoring, and targeted interventions in reading comprehension, vocabulary development, phonics/word study (as appropriate by grade level), fluency, and written response skills. Small-group instruction and differentiated supports will be used to address identified skill deficits and accelerate student growth toward grade-level proficiency.

Measurable Outcome

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.

By the end of the school year, **ELA lowest 25% learning gains** will increase from **68% to 71%** as measured by district and/or state assessments, with a focus on improving outcomes for students in the lowest 25% through explicit instruction and targeted support.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

This Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, observations, and coaching cycles using a tool aligned to explicit instruction. Administrators and the literacy coach will provide feedback and conduct reflective conferences to support instructional improvement. Impact will be measured through progress monitoring iReady, FAST PM 1, and PM2 data, with a focus on growth for the lowest 25% of ELA students. Data will be reviewed regularly to guide instruction, adjust interventions, and ensure progress toward closing achievement gaps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration and Instructional Coach

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The evidence-based intervention selected is explicit instruction in ELA, which includes clearly defined learning objectives, teacher modeling, guided practice, frequent checks for understanding, immediate corrective feedback, and opportunities for independent practice. Research has demonstrated that explicit instruction is highly effective in improving literacy outcomes, particularly for students performing below grade level. This intervention will be implemented through whole-group instruction, targeted small-group support, progress monitoring, and data-driven instructional adjustments to accelerate growth for the lowest 25% of achieving students.

Rationale:

Analysis of prior-year ELA data, including state assessments, benchmark assessments, and progress-monitoring results, identified the lowest 25% of students as a significant area of need. These students demonstrated gaps in reading comprehension, vocabulary, and written expression, impacting their ability to meet grade-level expectations. Explicit instruction was selected as the area of focus because it provides coherence with clear modeling, guided practice, immediate feedback, and targeted support that research shows are effective in accelerating student achievement. Through professional development, coaching, collaborative planning, and ongoing feedback, this initiative aims to improve literacy outcomes, increase student growth, and close achievement gaps for struggling learners.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Quarter One: Strengthening Explicit Instruction Through Clear Expectations and Collaborative Practice

Person Monitoring:

Adminstration

By When/Frequency:

Monthly SIP Reviews

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

Leadership:

•Set expectations for classroom walk throughs and observations by sharing walkthrough tool alignment to explicit instruction.

•Provide guided feedback in response to walk throughs and observations

•Set up time with teachers to give reflective feedback.

Coach:

•Facilitate PD at the beginning of the 2026-2027 school year to set explicit instruction expectations, opportunities to model explicit instruction in teacher classrooms.

• Schedule opportunities for reflective feedback with Tier 2 teachers.
Teachers:
•Attend PD at the beginning of the 2026-2027 school year that focus on components of explicit instruction, and strategies.
•Check in and reflect with admin, and coach on delivery of instruction (after walk-throughs).
•Collaboratively plan each unit with team to ensure coherence while focusing on explicit instruction.

Action Step #2
Quarter 2: Strengthening Data-Driven Instruction Through Walkthroughs, Coaching, and Collaborative Reflection

Person Monitoring:
Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Reviews

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Conduct regular classroom walk-through tools to monitor implementation and identify trends.
•Provide timely, actionable feedback to teachers within one week of walkthroughs and observations.
•Facilitate data conversations with teachers to review student progress and determine the effectiveness of explicit instruction practices.
Coach:
•Conduct coaching cycles with teachers, including lesson planning, modeling, observation, and reflective feedback.
•Monitor implementation fidelity and collaborate with administration to identify additional support needs.
•Support teachers in analyzing student achievement and progress-monitoring data to adjust instruction for the lowest 25% of learners.
Teachers:
•Utilize formative assessment data to plan differentiated instruction and interventions for students performing below grade level.
•Participate in collaborative planning sessions focused on strengthening explicit instruction, coherence, and student engagement.
•Reflect on instructional practices and student outcomes during meetings with administrators and the literacy coach.

Action Step #3
Quarter Three: Strengthening ELA Instruction for the Lowest 25% Through Targeted Coaching, Data-Driven Decisions, and Reflective Practice

Person Monitoring:
Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Reviews

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Conduct follow-up observations focused on the quality and consistency of explicit instruction, particularly in classrooms serving the lowest 25% of ELA learners.
Coach:
•Model effective explicit instruction in both whole-group and small-group settings, incorporating clear teacher modeling, think-alouds, and guided practice.
Teachers:
•Provide differentiated coaching support based on teacher needs and observation data.
•Support teachers in using formative and benchmark assessment data to make instructional decisions

and provide targeted interventions.
•Guide teachers through reflective conversations focused on student growth, instructional effectiveness, and next steps for improvement.

Action Step #4
Quarter Four: Evaluating and Sustaining Explicit Instruction Through Data Analysis, Reflection, and Continuous Implementation

Person Monitoring:
Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Reviews

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Evaluate the effectiveness of explicit instruction implementation through analysis of end-of-year student achievement data, walkthrough data, and observation results.
•Conduct final reflective conferences with teachers to celebrate successes, identify areas of growth, and establish goals for the following school year.
•Collaborate with the literacy coach to determine schoolwide strengths and needs related to explicit instruction and literacy achievement.
Coach:
• Analyze coaching, observation, and student achievement data to evaluate the impact of explicit instruction on student outcomes.
Teachers:
•Consistently implement explicit instruction practices with fidelity through the end of the school year.

Area of Focus #2

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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.

The area of focus is improving science achievement across all grade levels through the consistent implementation of standards-based instruction, collaborative teacher planning, and inquiry-based learning experiences. This focus emphasizes ensuring that all students receive rigorous, grade-level science instruction aligned to state standards while actively engaging in scientific exploration, problem-solving, and critical thinking.

Measurable Outcome

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.

In the 2026-2027 school year, Manatee Elementary School's **science** level of proficiency will increase from **86% to 89%.**

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

This area directly affects student learning by increasing students' understanding of scientific concepts, strengthening their ability to apply scientific knowledge, and improving performance on classroom, district, and state science assessments. Through collaborative planning, teachers can analyze standards, design high-quality lessons, and implement effective instructional strategies that address student learning needs. Inquiry-based exploration further supports student engagement and deeper conceptual understanding by providing opportunities for hands-on investigations and real-world applications of science content.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Shannon Daly, Courtney Shiffrin, Ilea Trahan, Ben Plechaty, Alexis Bergevin

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Explicit instruction is a structured, research-based approach in which teachers clearly model and explain new skills, guide students through supported practice, and gradually release responsibility for independent application during reteach time. In science, this approach is strengthened by incorporating hands-on investigations and inquiry-based learning experiences that allow students to explore concepts, test ideas, and construct understanding through active engagement. Instruction includes purposeful sequencing, ongoing checks for understanding, timely feedback, and multiple opportunities for guided and independent practice to ensure mastery of targeted standards.

Rationale:

Raising science proficiency by 3% is a strategic and attainable goal that directly supports our school's vision to ensure all students, when given explicit standard-aligned instruction, are engaged learners.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Quarter One: Building Coherent Science Instruction Through Structured Collaboration and Explicit Teaching Practices

Person Monitoring:

Adminstration

By When/Frequency:

Monthly SIP Reveiw

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Create a calendar for bi-monthly collaborate planning with science teachers, STEM, and innovation lab.
•Follow up with science teachers on information from PD, review pacing guide.
•Set expectations for classroom walkthroughs when observing explicit instruction.
Coach:
•Introduce profile practices for explicit instruction and address how these align with informational text, have state-based resources available for reteach and enrichment of science, and facilitate a PLC on cross-curricular explicit instruction.
Teachers:
•Fifth grade teachers will attend a PD at the beginning of the 2026-2027 school year on science benchmarks and expectations for the school year.
•The Science Team will meet with site-based STEM, Innovation Lab teacher, and administration to debrief August PD and set the intention for the first quarter, and set routines and expectations in the classroom for a safe and productive year in science.

Action Step #2
Quarter Two: Strengthening Science Instruction Through Collaborative Planning, Vocabulary Development, and Inquiry-Based Practices

Person Monitoring:
Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Review

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Meet monthly with science team to lead collaborative planning, walkthrough classrooms to observe explicit instruction and inquiry-based exploration, and provide constructive feedback to support goal of percentage of students proficient.
Coach:
•Assist with resources that can be utilized to enhance science vocabulary, meet with team to discuss how to utilize context clues to understand unfamiliar words in a science text, and continue to monitor profile practices of explicit instruction.
Teachers:
•Science Team will collaboratively plan explicit instruction with STEM and Innovation Lab teachers bi-monthly, continue to deliver explicit instruction with a focus on hands-on and inquiry-based exploration, and monitor PENDA data to drive instruction.

Action Step #3
Quarter Three: Strengthening Science Achievement Through Data-Driven Reteach, Collaborative Planning, and Targeted Instructional Support

Person Monitoring:
Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Review

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Analyze schoolwide and grade-level State Assessment data to identify standards below proficiency, create and monitor a targeted reteaching plan by providing teachers with aligned resources, protected intervention time, and ongoing progress-monitoring checkpoints.
•Continue to schedule walkthroughs to observe explicit instruction and inquiry-based exploration in

the science classroom.
Coach:
•Pull resources that align to the five lowest science standards for reteach, review the importance of coherence when delivering explicit instruction in the area of science, and facilitate a PLC on the profile practice of differentiation.
Teachers:
•Analyze PENDA data to schedule a science boot camp, collaboratively plan with STEM and innovation lab teachers bi-monthly, and continue to deliver explicit, inquiry-based instruction

Action Step #4
Quarter Four: Strengthening Science Instruction Through Data Monitoring, Targeted Interventions, and Collaborative Planning

Person Monitoring:
Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Review

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Monitor and support through walkthroughs and implementation of data reviews, meet with science team during collaborative planning, and provide CORE feedback to help drive instruction.
Coach:
•Facilitate a data PLC, align instructional materials to the rigor of the assessment.
•Co-teach targeted intervention groups to demonstrate effective scaffolding and differentiation.
Teachers:
•Use State Assessment resources to reteach previously taught standards that fell below proficiency on previous assessments.
•Create a schedule where each science teacher reteaches a specific benchmark so the students can rotate through the boot camp and demonstrate understanding.
•Continue to deliver explicit inquiry-based instruction.

Area of Focus #3

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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.

Manatee Elementary will focus on increasing mathematics learning gains for students in the Lowest 25%. A three year analysis shows a small increase in 2026. 2024-81%, 2025-59% and 2026-63%. Given that performance of the Lowest 25% is a critical accountability component and directly impacts overall school achievement, this area has been identified as a priority for improvement. Addressing this need will ensure more equitable student outcomes and support sustained growth in mathematics achievement across all grade levels.

Measurable Outcome

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.

In 2027, **mathematics lowest 25% learning gains** will increase from **63% to 67%**.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

We will monitor the progress of this target group using multiple data sources, including FAST assessments, classroom-based assessments, and iReady diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Adminstration

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Explicit instruction is a structured, research-based approach in which teachers clearly model and explain new skills, guide students through supported practice, and gradually release responsibility to allow for independent application during the reteach time. This approach incorporates purposeful sequencing, ongoing checks for understanding, timely feedback, and multiple opportunities for practice to ensure mastery.

Rationale:

There is a critical need to accelerate learning gains for students in this group by strengthening foundational and grade-level math skills. Targeted reteach time will be intentionally used to address specific skill gaps identified through data, rather than extending the core lesson of the day. Through explicit, systematic instruction—including modeling, think-alouds, chunking content, gradual release, and frequent checks for understanding—teachers will provide focused support to ensure these students build conceptual understanding and make measurable progress. Integrating best practices such as math discourse, manipulatives, and multiple representations will further deepen understanding and support access to grade-level content while addressing unfinished learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Quarter One: Improving Instructional Delivery Through Targeted Reteach and Feedback

Person Monitoring:
Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Reviews

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Revise the master schedule to allocate an additional 15 minutes for grades 2–6 to provide targeted reteach and intervention for students in the Lowest 25%.
•Establish clear, school-wide expectations for the instructional content to be utilized during reteach time.
•Provide targeted professional development to ensure teachers consistently implement these expectations.
Coach:
•Provide support and coaching to teachers to effectively implement explicit instruction and the gradual release model within daily lessons.
Teachers:
•Develop and implement a consistent instructional framework for delivering a 15-minute targeted reteach at the start of each math block. •Determine and identify students who fall within the Lowest 25% to ensure they receive targeted reteach and intervention supports.
•During collaborative planning sessions, develop and align lesson plans specifically designed to support and maximize the effectiveness of this targeted reteach time.

Action Step #2
Quarter Two: Strengthening Math Reteach Through Targeted Feedback, Explicit Instruction, and Data-Driven Planning

Person Monitoring:
Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Reviews

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Conduct classroom walkthroughs with a focused look at the implementation of math reteach time and provide targeted, actionable feedback to support effective instructional practices.
Coach:
•Offer guidance and professional support to teachers in effectively applying explicit instruction and the gradual release model within their daily reteach lessons.
Instructional:
•Participate in half-day math planning sessions to analyze current data and develop targeted lesson plans focused on reteaching priority standards.

Action Step #3
Quarter Three: Strengthening Data-Driven Instruction for the Lowest 25% Through Analysis, Targeted Planning, and Ongoing Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:
Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Reviews

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Conduct a mid-year analysis of student performance data, including FAST, formative, and classroom assessments, to evaluate progress of students in the Lowest 25%.
•Use analysis to identify trends, gaps, and instructional priorities.

•Develop and implement a targeted action plan that leverages a collaborative, “all hands on deck” approach to improve proficiency and increase learning gains for these students.
Coach:
•Facilitate collaborative data analysis to identify students who are not demonstrating adequate progress, as well as the specific skill gaps impacting their achievement.
Teachers:
•Consistently analyze student work and formative assessment data to adjust instruction and ensure the effectiveness of interventions and supports.

Action Step #4
Quarter Four: Strengthening Math Achievement Through Data Analysis, Targeted Reteach, Coaching, and Celebration of Growth

Person Monitoring:
Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Review

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Conduct a comprehensive end-of-year analysis of math performance data, including overall proficiency, and learning gains, to identify strengths, gaps, and trends that will inform future planning.
•Recognize and celebrate teacher and student accomplishments to reinforce a positive school culture and build momentum for continued growth.
Coach:
•Provide targeted coaching cycles focused on improving math learning gains by supporting teachers in planning and delivering data-driven reteach during the 15-minute intervention block.
Teacher:
•Teachers will utilize explicit instruction and the gradual release model to reteach priority standards identified through formative and summative data.

Area of Focus #4

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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.

ESE Behavior referrals have been increasing. School year 2024-2025 ESE students had 58 referrals. In school year, 2025-2026 ESE students had 147 referrals. By implementing Tier 1 behavior support/ interventions will improve overall ESE referrals.

Measurable Outcome

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.

In school year 2024-2025 Manatee referrals for ESE was 58 referrals. In school year 2025-2025 ESE

referrals were 147. The goal for the 26-27 school year is to **decrease referral to less than 100 (32% reduction)**.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Monitoring of this area of focus will occur through structured, ongoing data review and observation practices to ensure both implementation fidelity and measurable impact. Referral data will be analyzed on a bi-monthly basis to identify trends, track progress toward reduction goals, and determine which students may require additional support. In addition, quarterly monitoring using Power BI will provide a broader view of referral patterns across grade levels and subgroups, allowing for data-informed decision-making at the schoolwide level. To ensure alignment of practices, administrators and coaches will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs using a Tier 1 behavior checklist to assess the consistency and effectiveness of proactive classroom management strategies and identify areas for targeted support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Rita Gleason

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The selected evidence-based intervention is the implementation of Explicit Instruction within an Instructional Coherence framework. This structured and research-based approach focuses on clearly modeling and explicitly teaching both academic and behavioral expectations. Teachers utilize practices such as clear explanations, think-alouds, guided practice, and gradual release to ensure students understand expected behaviors and can apply them independently. By embedding explicit instruction across all grade levels, the school ensures consistency in how behavioral skills are taught, reinforced, and monitored.

Rationale:

Explicit instruction will strengthen student behaviors by establishing a cohesive learning environment where curriculum, instruction, and daily routines are aligned, resulting in consistent and predictable learning experiences.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3

action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Quarter One: Enhancing Student Behavior Through Proactive Supports

Person Monitoring:
Rita Gleason & Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Review

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•During preplanning, schedule a meeting with all teachers to review student behavior plans.
•Schedule Verbal De-escalation Training.
•Schedule the Behavior Analyst to discuss how to collect and track behavior data
•Share the Monthly MTSS Newsletter
•Track discipline data to identify students approaching 5 referrals and trigger proactive BIP reviews.
Coach:
•Facilitate collaborative planning and professional learning on explicit instruction.
•Conduct coaching cycles
Teachers:
•Participate in collaborative planning.
•Use peer buddy to share responsibility for minor behavior issues.
•Use verbal de-escalation strategies in class

Action Step #2
Quarter Two: Strengthening Behavior Supports Through Proactive Monitoring, Explicit Instruction, and Tiered Interventions

Person Monitoring:
Rita Gleason & Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Reveiw

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Schedule Addressing Challenging Behaviors (Part 1, Elementary).
•When data shows students are not making expected behavior changes, review Tier 1 behavior checklists.
•Track discipline data to identify students approaching 5 referrals and trigger proactive BIP reviews.
Coach:
•Integrate planning for explicit instruction.
Teachers:
•Review student behavior, work with behavior tech to adjust goals as needed.

Action Step #3
Quarter Three: Strengthening Behavior Supports Through Training, Data Monitoring, and Explicit Instructional Practices

Person Monitoring:
Rita Gleason & Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Reveiw

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Send Gleason to Bit Box Training (train the trainer).
•Track discipline data to identify students approaching 5 referrals and trigger proactive BIP reviews.

Coach:
•Continue explicit Instruction feedback to teachers.
Teachers:
•Participate in make and take session, related to Bit Box program.

Action Step #4
Quarter Four: Strengthening Behavior Systems Through Compliance, Data-Driven Decision Making, and Consistent Tiered Supports

Person Monitoring:
Rita Gleason & Adminstration

By When/Frequency:
Monthly SIP Reivew

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership:
•Ensure staff understand legal timelines and requirements (BIPs, MDRs, services)
•Allocate resources and staffing to support students with Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior needs.
•Track discipline data to identify students approaching 5 referrals and trigger proactive BIP reviews.
Coach:
• Lead data driven collaboration meetings.
Teachers:
•Re-teach and reinforce clear expectations, routines, and procedures to ensure a smooth end of the year.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Other: Positive Learning Environment

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.

ESE Behavior referrals have been increasing. School year 2024-2025 ESE students had 58 referrals. In school year, 2025-2026 ESE students had 147 referrals. By implementing Tier 1 behavior support/interventions will improve overall ESE referrals.

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.

In school year 2024-2025 Manatee referrals for ESE was 58 referrals. In school year 2025-2025 ESE referrals were 147. The goal for the 26-27 school year will decrease by 32%.

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.

Data Analysis - Monthly monitor referrals; Quarterly Monitoring - Monitor with Power BI quarterly referrals; Walkthrough Alignment - Conduct classroom walkthroughs with Tier 1 behavior checklist

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
Shannon Daly - Principal; Ilea Trahan - Assistant Principal; Courtney Shiffrin - Assistant Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
Explicit Instruction -(Instructional Coherence) This is an evidence-based and structured approach where teachers model and explain behavior skills.

Rationale:
Explicit instruction will strengthen student behaviors by establishing a cohesive learning environment where curriculum, instruction, and daily routines are aligned, resulting in consistent and predictable learning experiences.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Quarter 1

Person Monitoring:
Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:
Quarter 1

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions
* During preplanning, schedule a meeting with all teachers who have a student behavior plan.
* Verbal de-escalation training.
*Admin will schedule the Behavior Analyst to discuss how to collect and track behavior data
*Share the Monthly MTSS Newsletter
* Designate someone to monitor referrals monthly
* Track discipline data to identify students approaching 5 referrals and trigger proactive BIP reviews
Literacy Coach Actions:
* collaborative planning
* facilitate professional learning on explicit instruction; support teachers with tier 1 behavior
* conduct coaching cycles

Teacher Actions:
* collaborative planning
* schoolwide inclusive culture
* equitable participation in activities and recognition
* use peer buddy-share responsibility and resource facilitator
* use verbal-de-escalation strategies in class

Action Step #2
Quarter 2

Person Monitoring:
Leadership Team

By When/Frequency:
Quarter 2

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Leadership Actions:
*Charting Change Virtual Training
*Behavioral Principles: The Basics of Understanding Student Behavior
Understanding the Acting-Out Cycle
*Share the Monthly MTSS Newsletter

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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 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 Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), 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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(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. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(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 (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district 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) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year 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 2026-27 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply. **No**

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