**Marion County Public Schools** 

# Greenway Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 16 |
| Title I Requirements           | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 22 |

# **Greenway Elementary School**

207 MIDWAY RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[ no web address on file ]

# **Demographics**

**Principal: Leann Mcearchern** 

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2018-19 Title I School  | Yes  |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 100%   |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: C (43%)<br>2017-18: D (38%)<br>2016-17: D (37%)<br>2015-16: C (41%)<br>2014-15: C (44%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*  |
| SI Region   | Northeast  |
| Regional Executive Director   | <u>Cassandra Brusca</u>  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A  |
| Year  |  |
| Support Tier  |  |

| ESSA Status   | TS&I                             |
|---|----------------------------------|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F | or more information, click here. |

#### **School Board Approval**

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

#### **SIP Authority**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

# **Table of Contents**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 16 |
| Title I Requirements           | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 22 |

# **Greenway Elementary School**

207 MIDWAY RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[ no web address on file ]

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2)         |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 61%   |
| School Grades History                            |                        |   |
| ı  | 1                      | 1   |

2017-18

D

2016-17

D

2015-16

C

#### **School Board Approval**

Year

**Grade** 

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

2018-19

#### **SIP Authority**

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

### **Part I: School Information**

#### **School Mission and Vision**

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

Every child is capable of learning and has the potential to become a responsible, contributing adult member of society. Based upon this belief, it is the mission of Greenway Elementary to maintain a challenging curriculum with high expectations for all students to achieve their personal best, thus preparing them to develop into lifelong learners and problem solvers.

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

Greenway Elementary will provide an educational environment where each individual of the school community is valued, respected, and encouraged to reach their fullest potential as a productive citizen.

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name                | Title                  | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|
| North, Jamie        | Principal              | To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The employee in this position supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school and reports to the assigned administrator.  |
| Wheeler,<br>Scott   | Assistant<br>Principal | The assistant principal is mainly responsible for the overall academic and administrative responsibilities. assistant principal oversees curriculum, preparing students' and teachers' schedules, order textbooks and supplies and assist in maintaining a safe and orderly school environment   |
| Fronius,<br>Michael | Dean                   | Assists in the development, implementation, and evaluation of intervention programs that address the needs of at-risk students.  Performs a variety of administrative duties to assist the Principal in managing the school; assumes the duties of the Principal in the absence of the Principal and as assigned.  Assists the Principal in providing instructional leadership to the school.  Supervises and evaluates the performance of designated certificated and/ or classified personnel; assigns duties to faculty and staff as appropriate to meet school objectives; assists with the recruiting, interviewing, and selection of new faculty and staff.  Develops and administers disciplinary procedures in accordance with district policies and state laws; receives referrals and confers with students, parents, teachers, community agencies, and law enforcement; responds to and resolves parent, student, and staff concerns and complaints; serves on discipline or expulsion panels as assigned.  Supervises students on campus before and after school; monitors students during lunch, recess, passing periods, and other activities; instructs students in appropriate behavior; |

| Name               | Title                  | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|--------------------|------------------------|--|
|                    |                        | disciplines students in accordance with established guidelines.  |
|                    |                        | Monitors and organizes attendance functions; prepares letters, calls parents, and attends meetings as needed, regarding absent or tardy students; provides leadership for attendance improvement efforts.  |
|                    |                        | Facilitates the professional and intellectual development of teachers and aides.   |
|                    |                        | Helps to build positive relationships between teachers and administrators.   |
| Lanana             | la stantina a l        | Communicates, implements, and demonstrates practices in instruction that are known to improve teaching and education in general.   |
| Lorenz,<br>Jarrod  | Instructional<br>Coach | Communicates information between students, teachers, administrators and the community in general.  |
|                    |                        | Works with teachers to find effective ways to deal with behavioral issues in the classroom.  |
|                    |                        | Puts various tutoring programs into place and recruits teachers to host them.  |
| Joseph,<br>Anushka | Psychologist           | School psychologists consult with teachers, administrators, parents, and other stakeholders regarding a child's behavior, academic achievement, or other important issues that pertain to his or her schooling. School psychologists work with families to teach them strategies to address a host of issues, from managing a child's behavior to helping their child improve their social skills. |
|                    |                        | Facilitates the professional and intellectual development of teachers and aides.   |
|                    |                        | Helps to build positive relationships between teachers and administrators.   |
| VanDarra           | la atracation al       | Communicates, implements, and demonstrates practices in instruction that are known to improve teaching and education in general.   |
| VanDorn,<br>Audrey | Instructional<br>Coach | Communicates information between students, teachers, administrators and the community in general.  |
|                    |                        | Works with teachers to find effective ways to deal with behavioral issues in the classroom.  |
|                    |                        | Puts various tutoring programs into place and recruits teachers to host them.  |

| Name                    | Title                  | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Manzanares,<br>Patricia | Assistant<br>Principal | The assistant principal is mainly responsible for the overall academic and administrative responsibilities. assistant principal oversees curriculum, preparing students' and teachers' schedules, order textbooks and supplies and assist in maintaining a safe and orderly school environment |

# **Early Warning Systems**

#### **Current Year**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |     |     |    |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                        | K           | 1  | 2   | 3   | 4  | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled     | 104         | 93 | 108 | 139 | 98 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 676   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 15          | 13 | 13  | 16  | 18 | 17  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 92    |
| One or more suspensions         | 9           | 9  | 7   | 25  | 19 | 35  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 104   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 4           | 11 | 3   | 8   | 10 | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0   | 41  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| Indicator                            | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 14          | 19 | 20 | 34 | 31 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 185   |

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

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

### FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

47

### Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/11/2019

#### **Prior Year - As Reported**

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

| Indicator                       |   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
|                                 |   | 1           | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 | 20          | 15 | 18 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 76    |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 | 8           | 8  | 13 | 15 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72    |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 | 0           | 0  | 8  | 6  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 33 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 86    |  |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| Indicator                            |             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 5     |

## **Prior Year - Updated**

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

| ludicator                       |   |    |    |    | G  | rade | Le | vel |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|---|----|----|----|----|------|----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                       | K | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5    | 6  | 7   | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 | 20 | 15 | 18 | 12 | 11   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 76    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 | 8  | 8  | 13 | 15 | 28   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 8  | 6  | 11   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33 | 53   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 86    |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | evel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            |   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8    | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

# Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

#### **School Data**

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

| Sahaal Grada Companant      |        | 2019     |       |        | 2018     |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 39%    | 47%      | 57%   | 38%    | 52%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 48%    | 56%      | 58%   | 44%    | 57%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 47%    | 52%      | 53%   | 36%    | 53%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 42%    | 51%      | 63%   | 35%    | 52%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 43%    | 58%      | 62%   | 39%    | 54%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42%    | 49%      | 51%   | 35%    | 43%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 40%    | 47%      | 53%   | 35%    | 51%      | 51%   |

## **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       |         | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |          |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| indicator                       | K       | 1                                 | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       | Total    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students enrolled     | 104 (0) | 93 (0)                            | 108 (0) | 139 (0) | 98 (0)  | 134 (0) | 676 (0)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 15 (0)  | 13 (20)                           | 13 (15) | 16 (18) | 18 (12) | 17 (11) | 92 (76)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 9 (0)   | 9 (8)                             | 7 (8)   | 25 (13) | 19 (15) | 35 (28) | 104 (72) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 4 (0)   | 11 (0)                            | 3 (0)   | 8 (8)   | 10 (6)  | 2 (11)  | 38 (25)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 41 (0)  | 0 (33)  | 0 (53)  | 41 (86)  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### **Grade Level Data**

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

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

|              |            |        | ELA      |                                   |       |                                |
|--------------|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade        | Year       | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03           | 2019       | 39%    | 44%      | -5%                               | 58%   | -19%                           |
|              | 2018       | 34%    | 46%      | -12%                              | 57%   | -23%                           |
| Same Grade C | Comparison | 5%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con   | nparison   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04           | 2019       | 41%    | 49%      | -8%                               | 58%   | -17%                           |
|              | 2018       | 31%    | 43%      | -12%                              | 56%   | -25%                           |
| Same Grade C | Comparison | 10%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con   | nparison   | 7%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05           | 2019       | 34%    | 45%      | -11%                              | 56%   | -22%                           |
|              | 2018       | 35%    | 46%      | -11%                              | 55%   | -20%                           |
| Same Grade C | Comparison | -1%    |          |                                   | •     |                                |
| Cohort Con   | nparison   | 3%     |          |                                   |       |                                |

|              |           |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade        | Year      | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03           | 2019      | 51%    | 49%      | 2%                                | 62%   | -11%                           |
|              | 2018      | 44%    | 48%      | -4%                               | 62%   | -18%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 7%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04           | 2019      | 52%    | 54%      | -2%                               | 64%   | -12%                           |
|              | 2018      | 34%    | 47%      | -13%                              | 62%   | -28%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 18%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   | 8%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05           | 2019      | 25%    | 45%      | -20%                              | 60%   | -35%                           |
|              | 2018      | 44%    | 50%      | -6%                               | 61%   | -17%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -19%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |         |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| Cohort Com | parison | -9%    |          |                                   |       |                                |

|              |           |        | SCIENCE  |                                   |       |                                |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade        | Year      | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05           | 2019      | 39%    | 44%      | -5%                               | 53%   | -14%                           |
|              | 2018      | 39%    | 49%      | -10%                              | 55%   | -16%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

# Subgroup Data

|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 9           | 39        | 45                | 16           | 41         | 50                 | 20          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 25          | 40        | 33                | 33           | 36         | 39                 | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 27          | 46        | 65                | 19           | 26         | 43                 | 19          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 34          | 43        | 28                | 41           | 49         | 52                 | 45          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 32          | 50        |                   | 53           | 60         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 48          | 54        | 48                | 53           | 43         | 21                 | 44          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 32          | 45        | 47                | 35           | 42         | 51                 | 21          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2018      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 9           | 36        | 44                | 14           | 31         | 31                 |             |            |              | 2010 17                 | 2010 17                   |
| ELL       | 28          | 33        | · · ·             | 28           | 33         | 17                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 22          | 31        | 26                | 33           | 43         | 43                 | 26          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 35          | 48        | 43                | 39           | 37         | 24                 | 25          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 21          |           |                   | 43           | -          |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 41          | 38        | 46                | 50           | 47         | 32                 | 56          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 27          | 37        | 35                | 37           | 36         | 25                 | 32          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2017      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          | •                       |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2015-16 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2015-16 |
| SWD       | 7           | 31        | 33                | 8            | 26         | 31                 | 16          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 34          | 47        |                   | 31           | 63         | 50                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 23          | 36        | 33                | 21           | 25         | 27                 | 15          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 38          | 40        | 19                | 31           | 48         | 44                 | 35          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 38          | 42        |                   | 48           | 46         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 47          | 51        | 67                | 42           | 43         | 36                 | 41          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 31          | 39        | 35                | 29           | 35         | 33                 | 31          |            |              |                         |                           |

# **ESSA** Data

| This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.         |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 44   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 4    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 48   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 349  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 33   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       |      |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 36   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        |      |
| Native American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         |      |
| Asian Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  |      |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                   |      |
| Black/African American Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                 | 35   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  |      |
|   |      |

| Hispanic Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 42  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 49  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 44  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 39  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

#### **Analysis**

#### **Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Students with disabilities. Prior to this year, our SWD have not had consistent and targeted grade level instruction. Grade level curriculum alignment has since been restructured and aligned, as well as a certified teacher to service our SWD students.

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

Our ELL student's showed the largest decline in achievement and gains. This could be due to the level of English acquisition upon entering Greenway and/or lack of supplemental alignment of language resources.

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.

ELA Achievement. Possible factors: new teachers, new curriculum and greater proficiency reading gaps at grade levels 3-5.

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

ELA learning gains. Greenway implemented two reading intervention blocks, targeted instruction in areas of deficiency, and implemented a strong phonics based intervention program for tier 3 students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

An area of concern for Greenway moving forward is student suspensions. Greenway has a revised behavior intervention plan for the 2019-2020 school year, while also implementing a school-wide social/emotional program, Sanford Harmony.

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

- 1. Improving reading proficiency for all students.
- 2. Increasing learning gains for our SWD and ELL subgroups.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:** 

| #1   |   |
|--|---|
| Title  | Increase reading proficiency for all students.  |
| Rationale  | Based on our 2018-2019 FSA reading proficiency levels, instructional planning and alignment to the standards will continue to be an area of focus again for Greenway during the 2019-2020 school year.  |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | If we increase authentic literacy opportunities in grades K-5 through instructional alignment in reading, writing, math and science, then we can increase student reading proficiency in 3rd grade from 42% to 47%, 4th grade from 49% to 54% and 45% to 50% as measured through local and state assessments. |
| Person<br>responsible for<br>monitoring<br>outcome       | Audrey VanDorn (audrey.vandorn@marion.k12.fl.us)  |
| Evidence-<br>based Strategy                              | Instructional coaches will provide ongoing professional development on authentic literacy opportunities based on the Florida Standards.   |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-<br>based Strategy             | Through professional development teachers will learn how to implement instructional strategies that promote authentic reading opportunities across all content areas. As a result, reading proficiency will increase by 3% as measured by local and state progress monitoring assessments.                    |
| Action Step  |   |
| Description  | <ol> <li>Professional Development</li> <li>Modeling instructional strategies through side by side coaching</li> <li>Collaborative planning</li> <li>Classroom walkthroughs and look fors</li> <li>Student artifacts</li> </ol>  |
| Person<br>Responsible                                    | Audrey VanDorn (audrey.vandorn@marion.k12.fl.us)  |

| #2   |   |
|--|---|
| Title  | Improve School Culture Through a Positive School-Wide Behavior Plan.  |
| Rationale  | If we implement a positive school-wide behavior plan, then we will create positive classroom learning environments that result in higher levels of academic performance and decrease student discipline referrals by 50% in grades K-5.   |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | If we continue to implement the 7 Energy Bus principles, then we can decrease student behavior referrals by 12% at the end of the year.   |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome                | Michael Fronius (michael.fronius@marion.k12.fl.us)  |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy                               | Train new staff on the Energy Bus; a positive school culture program that outlines how positive energy within a school can drive positive academic outcomes for both teachers and students by applying 7 simple principles.   |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy              | Through implementing our seven Energy Bus character principles in 2018-2019, we developed a framework and foundation to support social/emotional learning and accountability.   |
| Action Step  |   |
| Description  | <ol> <li>On-board new Energy Bus staff members</li> <li>Behavior committee will meet monthly to review behavior data</li> <li>Monthly incentives and recognition activities</li> <li>Morning principle focus reminders</li> <li>Professional development on classroom management routines and procedures</li> </ol> |
| Person Responsible                                       | Scott Wheeler (scott.wheeler@marion.k12.fl.us)  |

| #3   |   |
|--|---|
| Title  | Increase reading proficiency for students with disabilities.  |
| Rationale  | Based on our 2018-2019 reading FSA, only 31% of our students with disabilities demonstrated proficiency.  |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | If we provide targeted small group instruction aligned to student reading deficits, then we can increase reading proficiency to 41% for our students with disabilities and increase academic achievement from 26% to 31% as measured by the FSA.  |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome                | Patricia Manzanares (patricia.manzanares@marion.k12.fl.us)  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy                           | Teachers will monitor student progress and modify instruction during tiered intervention blocks as measured by classroom progress monitoring checks and district quarterly assessments.   |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy          | Through professional development in designing and aligning tiered intervention lessons, teachers will learn how to implement instructional strategies that promote authentic reading opportunities across all content areas. As a result, reading proficiency will increase by 3% as measured by local progress monitoring assessments. |
| Action Step  |   |
| Description  | <ol> <li>Student data chats</li> <li>Frequent standards checks</li> <li>Targeted small group instruction</li> <li>PD on differentiated instructional best practices</li> <li>ESE support and collaboration</li> </ol>   |
| Person<br>Responsible                                    | Scott Wheeler (scott.wheeler@marion.k12.fl.us)  |

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

N/A

# Part IV: Title I Requirements

#### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Our SAC (School Advisory Council) committee will develop, implement, and evaluate all aspects of the Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) and Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP). The committee reviews the SIP, school data, develops revisions, and presents proposals to the SAC. All SAC members are provided opportunity to review and offer input to the plan, prior to offering their approval. Throughout the year, parents are

presented with school involvement surveys to evaluate the school's current parent activities. Data collected from parent surveys guides the activities planned for the following school year.

PFEP Goal: If we provide capacity building strategies to parents and families that address and promote positive home environments then the at home environment will foster continued learning linked to core subjects and social emotional learning (SEL) strategies as measured by local assessments and discipline data.

Our site-based PFEP will describe our commitment to engage parents and families in the education of their children and to build the capacity to implement family engagement strategies and activities designed to achieve the school and student academic achievement goals. Through the following capacity building events; we will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

#### Title I Annual Meeting

To provide an explanation of Title I and begin the ongoing discussion of schoolwide participation and of its link to student achievement.

August 2019

K-5 Family Reading and Math Nights

Increased foundational literacy skills in both reading and math.

November 2019 & April 2020

Literacy on the Lawn

Increase reading and reading comprehension.

October 2019

**Nutrition and Wellness Nights** 

Increase parent and student awareness on healthy nutritional habits and the impact on your overall well-being as a child.

September 2019, December 2019 & March 2020

#### **PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

MCPS Psychological Services supports the united efforts of parents, educators, and the community to raise student performance. Psychological Services provides assessment, consultation, progress monitoring, and mental health services to improve the academic and emotional well-being of all students. Crisis Response Resources

Information and resources to assist parents and educators help students through a time of crisis:

Talking to Children About Violence: Tips for Parents and Teachers

Bullies and Victims: A Primer for Parents

When Grief/Loss Hits Close to Home: Tips for Caregivers Care for the Caregiver: Tips for Families and Educators

What You CAN Do - Meaningful Action Matters in the Face of Violence

Helping Children Cope With Traumatic Events

Trauma Informed Care Resources

Suicide Prevention - 13 Reasons Why: Information Sheet and Resource Guide Prevensión del Suicidio Juvenil: Consejos para Padres y Educadores?

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

All students are fully integrated into the school setting thus helping them transition to Kindergarten. In addition, information is provided to parents from the Title I Office on the HIPPY (Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters) program.

MCPS provides an Exception Student Education Pre-K Program in our District for eligible 3 thru 5 year children. All students are fully integrated into the school setting which provides help in the transition to Kindergarten.

Kindergarten registration begins in April and continues until school begins in the fall. Beginning in April, Marion County Public Schools coordinated with Childhood Development Services Inc. and the Early Learning Coalition to assist in the registration of Pre-K students. A school-based, week long, Kindergarten Round Up is planned for the spring and is advertised through community based flyers, letters via backpack, and a SkyLert message. An orientation is provided to all parents of kindergarten students to give them information regarding school policies and procedures to help orient them to the school. STAGGER START is a district initiative to assist kindergarten students in transitioning into local elementary schools. The primary focus of stagger start is to give the staff the opportunity to administer assessments, including FLKRS, and begin to develop one- on-one relationships with students.

As we begin to move from Elementary to Middle School, during Feeder Pattern meetings we are able to find areas that need to be addressed as students move from elementary to middle school. An emphasis on meeting the academic expectations required for 6th grade.

Early learning, elementary, middle and high school curriculum maps are shared and utilized throughout all levels of education to ensure an alignment of standards and expectations to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of student in transition from one school level to another.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

#### **Elementary School Instruction**

- a. Providing differentiated instruction for students at all levels is a best practice to meet students' needs in mastering the Florida Standards (FS)/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS). Instructionally sound strategies for grouping students will be used to enhance the academic achievement of all students. Any grouping of students shall provide opportunities for the regrouping of students during a portion of the school day (i.e., within the general education classroom, during specials, lunch, or other portion of the school week).
- b. Ability groups are organized according to accelerated needs such as higher-level coursework or remedial needs of individual students. Ability group configurations are flexible and continually monitored for student progress and movement.

The Problem Solving Team will meet weekly throughout the year to discuss the progress of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3. The leadership team will also meet weekly to discuss the implementation of the Tier 1 core curriculum.

Unify and Intervention Data will be used to provide student achievement information to the Problem

Solving team and the leadership team to analyze for the effectiveness of the core curriculum and supplemental supports provided to students not making progress with the core curriculum. Members of the Problem Solving team will meet with staff members at least once a semester to discuss the

MTSS process and the progress of their students in Tier 2 and Tier 3. Teachers and members of the Problem Solving Team will invite parents of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 to discuss the implementation of interventions and the progress of their child.

Each site Principal is responsible for site-based inventory of resources/services as well as necessary problem solving and application.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Marion County Public Schools implements standards provided by the state that are set to prepare students for success and make them competitive in the global workplace. Each Florida Standard provides clear expectations for the knowledge and skills students need to master in each grade (K-12) and subject so they will be prepared to succeed in college, careers and life.

The district of Marion County Public Schools implements standards, provided by the state, that are set to prepare students for success and make them competitive in the global workplace. Each Florida Standard provides clear expectations for the knowledge and skills students need to master in each grade level (K-12) and subject area, so they will be prepared to succeed in college, a career and be functional in society on a daily basis. At the elementary level, this is established through STEM and STEAM curriculum, off and on campus field trips, and business and community volunteers.In 2019-2020, Greenway will host a career day focusing on STEAM careers available throughout our community.

# Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase reading proficiency for all students.                       | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Improve School Culture Through a Positive School-Wide Behavior Plan. | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Increase reading proficiency for students with disabilities.         | \$0.00 |
|   |        | Total:   | \$0.00 |