Emerald Shores Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Emerald Shores Elementary School

404 EMERALD RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Stacy Houston

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (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 (41%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (37%) 2014-15: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.	

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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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

Emerald Shores Elementary School

404 EMERALD RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	D	C	D

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 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 https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

As a team, we will build a respectful, supportive community focused on clear communication, consistent expectations, and engaging learning opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Moving beyond the basics through collaboration, communication, critical thinking, and creativity to create 21st century lifelong learners.

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
Houston, Stacy	Principal	MCIES Observations; Summative Evaluations for Instructional & Non-instructional employees; Crisis Management; CIMS/SIP; Budgets; PFEP; Staff Discipline; Staff Handbook; Parent Handbook; SAC/PTO; Community Liaison.
Ewart, Samantha	School Counselor	Guidance Services; IEP Staffings as needed; MTSS; School Liaison for outside agencies; DCF calls; MDT Meeting Coordinator; Suicide Risk; Coordinate & Organize Donations; Counseling Groups; Holiday Assistance; Food Backpacks; 504 Contact; CUME Folder Reviews; Monitor Attendance/Tardies; ESE Students - Tier 3; Gifted, Academic, Mental, & Behavioral Referrals.
Maio, Brittany	Instructional Coach	Model & provide classroom support for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; i-Ready Monitoring for reading; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for ELA; MTSS Interventions coordinator; Enter reading data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various reading programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for para-professionals; Implement & monitor data folders for reading; Literacy Committee,
Ricks, Marcia	Dean	Discipline; Positive Panthers Committee Chair; Cafeteria Duty - train paras; Assist in preparing staff for ALICE & Fire drills; Distribute Crisis Management plans; PST Meetings for Discipline; Transportation/Bus safety issues; Model & support teachers with Classroom Management; ISS Faciltator; Threat Risk Referrals; Alternative Placements/Expulsions; K-Kids; Patrols.
Rowe, James	Assistant Principal	MCIES Observations; Discipline - point person; MTSS - Behavior plans & PST's for specified students; Assist in preparing staff for ALICE & Fire drills; MDT Team; Materials management - textbook inventory & distribution, chromebooks carts, destiny; Threat assessment referrals; Enter PD courses in TNL; Safety Chair; Volunteer approval; Facilitation of staff furniture moves; SAC & PTO.
McPhee, Monica	Assistant Principal	MCIES Observations; Pre-K Point Person; MTSS - Academic PMP's & PST's for specified students; Curriculum - PK - 5th grade; 3rd Grade Portfolios; Skyward Gradebook - Report Cards/Interim Reports; Award's & Graduation Ceremonies - Planning, organization, & ordering; EOY Student sorts & assist IPC with student scheduling in Skyward; Elementary Testing Coordinator; 504 Meetings & ESOL Staffings; Weekly INformer Creation & Panther Press; Kagan Coaching (Structure of the month); Update Sharepoint; SAC/PTO.
Ashberger, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Model & provide classroom support for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; i-Ready Monitoring for math; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for Math; MTSS Interventions coordinator - math; Enter math data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		teachers with various math programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for para-professionals; Implement & monitor data folders for math; Career Day Coordinator; Math Committee Chair.
Fortner, Peggy	Instructional Coach	Model & provide classroom support for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for Sci.; Enter science data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various science programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; STEAM Showcase Coordinator; Title 1 Parent Liaison; Science Committee Chair.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	100	102	85	104	118	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611
Attendance below 90 percent	24	21	16	18	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	15	34	42	47	60	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	255
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	11	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	58	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	16	32	41	36	58	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
43

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/12/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	19	25	16	23	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	9	10	8	15	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	18	12	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	58	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	21	32	31	30	36	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	19	25	16	23	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	9	10	8	15	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	18	12	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	58	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	21	32	31	30	36	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195

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).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	34%	47%	57%	48%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	56%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	52%	53%	51%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	32%	51%	63%	44%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	42%	58%	62%	43%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	49%	51%	21%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	47%	53%	32%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	100 (0)	102 (0)	85 (0)	104 (0)	118 (0)	102 (0)	611 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	24 (19)	21 (25)	16 (16)	18 (23)	22 (15)	21 (12)	122 (110)
One or more suspensions	15 (9)	34 (10)	42 (8)	47 (15)	60 (15)	57 (10)	255 (67)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (2)	11 (18)	10 (12)	3 (3)	0 (0)	0 (2)	26 (37)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	44 (16)	58 (58)	66 (95)	168 (169)

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-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	35%	44%	-9%	58%	-23%
	2018	35%	46%	-11%	57%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	49%	-17%	58%	-26%
	2018	33%	43%	-10%	56%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	34%	45%	-11%	56%	-22%
	2018	35%	46%	-11%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	35%	49%	-14%	62%	-27%
	2018	28%	48%	-20%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	54%	-16%	64%	-26%
	2018	33%	47%	-14%	62%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	25%	45%	-20%	60%	-35%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	61%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	44%	-11%	53%	-20%
	2018	39%	49%	-10%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	56	65	20	45	50	33				
ELL	26	57		41	43		30				
BLK	23	48	55	23	40	30	20				
HSP	40	53	58	38	40		29				
MUL	30	39		27	39						
WHT	43	60	58	35	46	50	48				
FRL	30	50	59	28	41	33	28				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	35	42	17	41		27				
ELL	39	43		39	29						
BLK	25	34	36	31	38	31	46				
HSP	35	34	40	37	35		39				
MUL	35	38		25	38						
WHT	46	40		40	46	40	60				
FRL	34	37	26	34	41	34	45				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	28	48	43	27	33						
ELL	47			63							
BLK	42	57	36	35	44	21	16				
HSP	43	65		49	47		18				
MUL	31			38							
WHT	59	51	36	49	42	25	53				
FRL	46	60	50	42	41	15	28				

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	34
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	49
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	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

The lowest performance from the 2019 school year was in Math Achievement. EMS earned 32 percentage points for students in 3rd - 5th grade scoring a Level 3 or above. There were several contributing factors that could account for the lack of growth in this area. They include: school-wide focus was in all areas of reading based on previous year's declines; math coach was teaching in a class for the majority of the school year due to teacher openings for the entire year; new teachers in both 4th and 5th grade that were teaching math and learning math content.

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

The subject area that showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 was in science with a 12 point decrease. We had 2 new teachers to 5th grade teaching the science standards and this was a different cohort of students. The same cohort of students were at 32% proficient in the area of reading in the 2018 school year.

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.

The area that had the largest gap when compared to the state average was in Math Achievement which had a 31 percentage point gap. There were several contributing factors that could account for the lack of growth in this area. They include: school-wide focus was in all areas of reading based on previous year's declines; math coach was teaching in a class for the majority of the school year due to teacher openings for the entire year; new teachers in both 4th and 5th grade that were teaching math and learning math content.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was the lowest quartile of students making learning gains in ELA. The actions that occurred last year that assisted in these positive gains include: early intervention protocols for all students in reading; consistent monitoring of reading interventions to include flexible changes based on data; and additional hour utilized daily ti provide reading interventions to students below grade level.

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

The number of one or more suspensions along with number of students at a 90% or below attendance average are huge concerns for the upcoming year. If students are not in school, how can they learn.

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

1. Increasing percentage of students scoring a level 3 in reading.
2. Increasing percentage of students scoring a level 3 in math.
3.Increasing the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in the area of reading.
4. Increasing the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in the area of math.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing the percentage of students scoring a level 3 in reading & math.
Rationale	By identifying all of the students scoring a Level 2 in reading and math and providing intense interventions as well as actively monitoring their progress in these subject areas the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 in reading will increase.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If teachers create and implement an effective learner environment that is engaging and aligned to learner needs, then 80% of 4th and 5th graders scoring a Level 2 on the 2018-2019 FSA in reading and in math will increase their score to at least a level 3 on the 2019-2020 FSA in the area of reading.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students scoring a Level 2 on the previous year's FSA will receive intense interventions based on their immediate weakness in the area of reading or math by a highly qualified teacher for 90 minutes per day for reading and 40-45 per week for math. The intervention will be monitored for effectiveness and every 6 -8 weeks a determination will be made to continue the intervention or if changes need to be made.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This was the strategy used in the previous school year for all students in the area of reading and we had 52% of our students earn a learning gain.

Action Step	
Description	1. Analyze each student scoring a level 2 on the 2019 reading & math FSA and determine area of need in each area. 2. Place all Level 2 students in appropriate research based interventions. 3. Every 6-8 weeks review any and all data to determine if students are making gains in the area of reading. 4. Set goals with students throughout the school year. 5. Make changes to students' intervention groups as needed. 6. Provide continuing PD to all staff related to Learner Engagement. (20 day action plans are created for this.)
Person Responsible	Brittany Maio (brittany.maio@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increasing the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in the area of reading and math.
Rationale	By identifying all of the students scoring in the bottom quartile in reading & math and providing intense interventions as well as actively monitoring their progress in reading the percentage of students achieving a learning gain in reading should increase. This would include all 3rd grade retainees.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If teachers create and implement an effective learner environment that is engaging and aligned to learner needs, then the percentage of students in the lowest quartile will increase from 58% to 63% in the area of reading and from 35% to 45% in the area of math as measured by the 2019-2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students that scored in the lowest quartile in reading and math on the previous year's FSA will receive intense reading and math interventions based on their immediate weakness in each area by a highly qualified teacher for 90 minutes per day in reading and 30-45 minutes per week in math. The intervention will be monitored for effectiveness and every 6-8 weeks a determination will be made to continue the intervention or if changes need to be made.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This was the strategy used in the previous school year for all students in the area of reading and we had 52% of our students earn a learning gain.

Action Step	
Description	1. Analyze & continue to monitor the students that will be in the lowest quartile in reading based on the 2019 reading and math FSA and determine area of need in both reading and math. 2. Place students in appropriate research based intervention(s). 3. Every 6-8 weeks review any and all reading data to determine if students are making gains in the area of reading. 4. Set goals with students throughout the school year. 5. Make changes to students' intervention groups as needed. 6. Provide continuing PD to all staff related to Learner Engagement. (20 day action plans are created for this.)
Person Responsible	Brittany Maio (brittany.maio@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	122 / 611 students in the 18-19 school year had a less than 90% attendance rate.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If school staff monitors student attendance and provides relevant motivators for students and parents, then the average monthly attendance rate will increase from 93.2% to 94.2%. A one percentage increase measured over the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Samantha Ewart (samantha.ewart@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using the Attendance Works web-site, staff will receive professional development using the approaches, strategies, and tools to address chronic absenteeism.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Absenteeism affects the whole school. Everyone on staff must play a role in supporting student attendance rates.

Action Step	
Description	1. Guidance Counselor will inform the 19-20 teachers of students still attending our school in 19-20 that had an attendance rate of 90% or less. Teachers will be asked to make positive phone calls to these parents within the first 2 weeks of school in order to begin building a relationship. 2. Create a 3 tiered intervention protocol at the school from universal at the tier 1 level to individualized at the tier 3 level. 3. Create an engaging school climate that builds positive relationships with students & families. Begin educating all regarding the impact of absences on achievement through the monthly newsletters and the weekly Panther Press calls that are sent out to parents. 4. Class attendance rates will be monitored and the classes with the highest rates in each grade level will be recognized monthly at the Panther Pep Rallies. 5.Guidance counselor & attendance clerk will work together to monitor chronic absences and make personalized phone calls to families. 6. As students are identified throughout the year action plans addressing barriers will be created. 7. Identified students will be partnered with caring mentors that will check in with them after an absence and to encourage coming to school everyday. 8. After a 5 absences in a nine week period parents will receive letters
Person Responsible	Samantha Ewart (samantha.ewart@marion.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Early Warning Indicators
Rationale	252/611 students have 2 or more early warning indicators.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we incorporate effective SEL (Social Emotional Learning) curriculum across the campus, the number of discipline referrals will decrease from the 18-19 school year as compared to the 19-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Pre-K and Kindergarten teachers will implement Conscious Discipline curriculum and grades 1 - 5 will implement Sanford Harmony Curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on last year's BESS screener from the 18-19 school year, 22% of the students on our campus indicate a need for additional support in Social Emotional Learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide training for Conscious Discipline for all Pre-K and Kindergarten teachers. 2. Provide training for Sanford Harmony for all 1st - 5th grade teachers. 3. Incorporate time in the daily schedule to implement the lessons from these SEL programs. 4. Provide support for teachers and assistance with the implementation of these programs.
Person Responsible	Samantha Ewart (samantha.ewart@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).

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, Â§ 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.

Two Areas of Focus for Emerald Shores this year are related to school and classroom culture as well as Parent Engagement. Two actions steps related to culture are: 1. for all teachers to make a positive phone call home for every student within the first 2 weeks of school in order to establish a positive rapport with all parents; and 2. have individual student interviews with all students in order to get to know each student on an individual basis. Some of the action steps for Parent Engagement include the Strong Fathers, Strong Families events throughout the school year

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.

Emerald Shores ensures that the social-emotional needs of all students are being met in a multitude of ways. With a skilled staff that includes: a school psychologist, staffing specialist, a mental health trained guidance counselor, a dean, a behavior technician, and social worker; students are addressed and paid attention to by implementing a number of individual services. Those services include: Individual Education Plans, individual and group counseling, 504 accommodations, parent/teacher conferences, behavior plans, and rewards. Each student's cumulative folder is thoroughly viewed so teacher and staff can determine the best academic and/or behavior path for that student. A multi-tiered system of interventions, psycho-educational testing, and observations for occupational, speech, or physical therapies are also implemented to ensure all students are exactly where they need to be and are receiving the services they need to succeed in the classroom. Communication between staff members is paramount and done on a daily basis through e-mails and personal visits to classrooms and offices. In addition to services, students are able to earn rewards on a daily basis. In order to help keep students motivated to learn and stay on track with their academic and behavioral goals, students are rewarded for their progress with incentives such as panther cash.

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

STAGGER START is a district wide program designed to assist students in transitioning into local elementary schools. Nine to ten students per day attend school during the first two days, giving Kindergarten teachers the opportunity to administer assessments, to develop one-on-one relationships with students, and to reduce anxiety associated with starting school. The Wonders placement test, DAP Assessments, and FLKRS are assessment tools used to determine the readiness needs of these Kindergarten students. Students who need intensive interventions will receive additional assistance from trained teachers and paraprofessionals, utilizing Reading Mastery and Early Interventions in Reading. Title 1 funds are used to deliver parent workshops which provides specific strategies for improving children's reading achievement. During the spring and summer kindergarten enrollment periods, information is shared with parents regarding the state funded Voluntary Pre-K opportunities and the Home Instruction of Parents of Pre-School Youngsters (HIPPY). This year Emerald Shores is offering a Pre-K/VPK School Year program for up to 80 students within this elementary feeder pattern to ensure students have a successful transition to Kindergarten.

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.

This team meets on a weekly basis. We meet to discuss the needs of all students, disseminate information and materials, discuss programs that will be implemented, and address feedback from teachers. The team provides administrative support to ensure commitment, resources and teacher support to share in the common goal of improving instruction and overall to build staff support, sustainability over time. Avalialble resources are maintained in school based accounting system and managed by school secretary (Kathy Cook) and Principal--Stacy Houston
Weekly "INTEL" Team meetings ensure that our new teachers stay fully informed re: policies, procedures,
district/school based initiatives, student performance, and best practices. These INTEL meetings allow for grade level collaboration to maximize teacher success!

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.