

Marion County Public Schools

# Reddick Collier Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Reddick Collier Elementary School

4595 W HIGHWAY 316, Reddick, FL 32686

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

**Principal: Donald Manning**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (43%) 2014-15: D (35%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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 [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	21

## Reddick Collier Elementary School

4595 W HIGHWAY 316, Reddick, FL 32686

[ 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 PK-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	72%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.**

Reddick-Collier celebrates the people we are, the work we do and the difference we make.

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

Reddick-Collier is building a strong foundation to graduation and beyond.

### 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
Sandy, Christine	Principal	Day to day management of school site School- home Liaison Facilitator Pre K - 5th grade Instructional Leader Student Service Support Team Member Professional Development Facilitator School Safety Coordinator Human Resource Operations Student Achievement Monitor
Roberts, Tina	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for math and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Allen, Clayton	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Krietemeyer, Carol	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Ray, Janice	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success

## 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	66	53	48	58	67	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	359
Attendance below 90 percent	13	17	7	7	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	9	7	16	6	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	7	14	3	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	35	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

**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	10	15	23	13	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

**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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

30

**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													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	7	7	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	7	14	10	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	3	11	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	30	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

**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	2	10	14	15	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

**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	0	8	7	7	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	7	14	10	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	3	11	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	30	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

**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	2	10	14	15	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	

## 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	40%	47%	57%	39%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	51%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	53%	52%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	46%	51%	63%	41%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	58%	62%	45%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	49%	51%	35%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	47%	53%	39%	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	66 (0)	53 (0)	48 (0)	58 (0)	67 (0)	67 (0)	359 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (0)	17 (8)	7 (7)	7 (7)	15 (12)	6 (8)	65 (42)
One or more suspensions	9 (1)	7 (7)	16 (14)	6 (10)	12 (15)	12 (24)	62 (71)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (0)	7 (7)	14 (3)	3 (11)	3 (4)	8 (3)	40 (28)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (31)	35 (30)	34 (26)	86 (87)

### 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	45%	44%	1%	58%	-13%
	2018	33%	46%	-13%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	30%	49%	-19%	58%	-28%
	2018	34%	43%	-9%	56%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	46%	45%	1%	56%	-10%
	2018	28%	46%	-18%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	49%	15%	62%	2%
	2018	28%	48%	-20%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		36%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	54%	-12%	64%	-22%
	2018	31%	47%	-16%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	34%	45%	-11%	60%	-26%
	2018	38%	50%	-12%	61%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	44%	-7%	53%	-16%
	2018	29%	49%	-20%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	9	38	38	10	62	62					

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
ELL	42	73		48	71						
BLK	31	56	42	41	58	57	17				
HSP	39	59		50	59		36				
WHT	52	56		49	53		55				
FRL	35	54	46	44	56	63	31				
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	3	8	6	6	19	13	14				
ELL	16	8		11	23						
BLK	22	22	18	21	35	19	11				
HSP	29	19		26	31		33				
WHT	51	34		50	46		57				
FRL	28	25	17	29	36	18	27				
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	14	25	30	17	35						
ELL	21			21							
BLK	28	51	50	24	37		22				
HSP	31	38		35	46						
WHT	58	60		62	50		73				
FRL	36	51	55	36	42	35	33				

### 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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	416
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	62
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	53
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	51
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.**

\*4th grade ELA

\*5th grade Math

The ELA data indicates a decline in 4th grade ELA proficiency in both cohort comparison by 3% and in same grade result by 4%. A contributing factor in this decline was the stability of the faculty and the design of the instructional delivery. The faculty at that grade level grade level finally stabilized in February and also by then, the instructional delivery had departmentalized with consistent push in support. The The math data indicates a 4% decline in 5th grade proficiency from 17-18 to 18 -19. However, the same cohort of students from 4th to 5th highlighted a 3% increase in proficiency. Students at this grade level were functioning a year behind expectation and lacked expertise numbers and operations. Consequently, as 5th grade standards were being taught, students struggled in their mastery of the content and did not met expected growth.

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

\*5th grade Math

The 4% math decline in 5th grade is linked to the mastery of previous math standards at other grade levels. There was such a gap in overall math mastery across grade levels, student achievement is culminating in 5th grade where for the last two years, the level of proficiency remains below 40%. Contributing to this gap has been teacher efficacy in understanding effective math strategies, student mastery of basic math operations and classroom instruction to the depth and breathe of the math standards. Math has traditionally been an area of needed improvement across all grade levels and this data is highlighted the continued need for improvement.

**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 reading and math proficiencies each averaged about 17% behind state averages, while science was 16% behind the state. In totality the data indicates a closing of the achievement gap from the previous year however, there is still a deficiency. In the previous year the gap between the school and the state demonstrated 20 - 30% differences, whereas this year, the gap has reduced to 10 - 20 %

differences. 4th grade ELA, 5th grade math and 5th grade science were contributing factors in this overall continued gap. Within each of these grade levels, student proficiencies did not meet expectations and consequently, the learning gains and bottom quartile did not demonstrate growth.

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

Overall, student proficiency 3rd grade for ELA and math demonstrated the greatest improvement from the previous year. Third grade math exceeded state averages. Our school had a new focus on standards-based instruction. Experienced teachers in this grade level was also a factor.

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

Two potential areas of concern are 42 students with attendance below 90% and 87 students with a Level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Standards-based instruction
2. Student ownership of learning
3. Strong formative assessments to inform instruction
4. Build teacher knowledge of high-impact instruction and higher-order questioning

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Instruction: Instructional Activities/Strategies
<b>Rationale</b>	For the past two years the Students with Disabilities subgroup has fell below the Federal Index. A focus on higher-level questioning and student discourse will lead to an increase in proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>If teachers incorporate higher-level questioning and student discourse in academic instruction, then targeted students identified with a Federal Index below 40% will show an increase in proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math as measured by the 2019-20 FSA.</p> <p>Students with Disabilities subgroup currently at 31% will increase to 41%.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Clayton Allen (clayton.allen@marion.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers will participate in weekly professional development opportunities that facilitate learning in higher-level questioning and student discourse. Professional development will focus on evidence-based strategies such as Bloom's Taxonomy, Socratic Circles, and standards-based questioning techniques. Weekly collaborative planning will include a focus on the evaluation and/or creation of higher-order content specific questions for all students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Rationale for this strategy is that testing data and classroom observations indicate that there is a need for teacher training to introduce instructional questioning during that is necessary for student success. Evidence of effectiveness will include classroom walkthroughs and observations, as well as district testing data such as i-Ready and QSMAs.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide teachers with effective questioning resources and tools.</li> <li>2. Provide opportunities to practice effective questioning strategies within collaborative planning.</li> <li>3. Provide opportunities for teachers to observe effective questioning strategies in other classrooms.</li> <li>4. Develop and embed student discourse techniques within the Social Studies block.</li> <li>5. Utilize DBQs in grades 3-5 and the Knowledge portion of CKLA in grades K-2 to provide opportunities for higher-order thinking and questioning.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Carol Krietemeyer (carol.krietemeyer@marion.k12.fl.us)



#2	
<b>Title</b>	Instruction: Teaching Informed by Multiple Types of Assessments
<b>Rationale</b>	If we focus on effective formative assessments linked to the standards we can better identify which students are in need of remediation.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>If teachers use formative assessments to plan and deliver Florida Standards aligned instruction in Reading and Math, then students in grades 3-5 will show an increase in proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math as measured by the 2019-20 FSA.</p> <p>-3rd grade will increase ELA proficiency from 35% to 40%, math proficiency will maintain 64%</p> <p>-4th grade will increase ELA proficiency from 30% to 40%, math proficiency will increase from 42% to 45%</p> <p>-5th grade will increase ELA proficiency from 46% to 50%, math proficiency will increase from 34% to 40%</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Christine Sandy (christine.sandy@marion.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Evaluate the effectiveness of formative assessments in the context of daily classroom instruction and their impact on redirecting instruction to address student's remedial needs.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Last year we could not be responsive to student's remedial needs with the data points utilized. Effective formative assessments will be utilized as a tool to impact daily instruction, student mastery of standards, and improve teacher efficacy of understanding what the formative assessment data is saying about student mastery.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement and evaluate district provided standards mastery checks.</li> <li>2. Provide professional development on formative assessments. What do they look like and how do they fit into the classroom instruction.</li> <li>3. Analyze data from formative assessments to redirect instruction and meet the needs of students.</li> <li>4. Track data points through student data notebooks and conduct data chats for teachers and students.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Christine Sandy (christine.sandy@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Instruction: Instructional Activities/Strategies
<b>Rationale</b>	When students have an understanding of their own learning they will be more actively engaged in the outcome of their learning. Observations from last year indicated that student engagement was an area of focus.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>If teachers foster effective student ownership strategies for learning, then all students will show an increase in proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math as measured by the 2019-20 FSA.</p> <p>-3rd grade will increase ELA proficiency from 35% to 40%, math proficiency will maintain 64%</p> <p>-4th grade will increase ELA proficiency from 30% to 40%, math proficiency will increase from 42% to 45%</p> <p>-5th grade will increase ELA proficiency from 46% to 50%, math proficiency will increase from 34% to 40%</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Christine Sandy (christine.sandy@marion.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Data notebooks, rubrics, and self-reflections will be utilized as evidence for this strategy.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Student ownership focuses on student driven decision making and student empowerment. These internalizing factors can be difficult to measure, consequently the outcome measures and outputs will reflect more on the effectiveness of the strategies, not true student ownership. Students will create and manage data notebooks tracking data points on formative assessments. Students will also participate in activities with rubrics and have opportunities for self-reflection.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop the framework of understanding with faculty and staff.</li> <li>2. Work towards specific activities including student led open house and student led conferencing.</li> <li>3. Students will set learning goals for themselves and monitor progress through data notebooks.</li> <li>4. Students will receive incentives for accomplishing goals.</li> <li>5. Implement mental health curriculum to give students the knowledge and tools to have a greater ownership of their academic and social outcomes.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Tina Roberts (tina.roberts@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, 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.**

Our Parent & Family Engagement Plan (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 assessment and 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; RCE will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Open House / 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.

September 2019

Dad, Take Your Child to School Day

Home-School connection increases as parents stay involved.

September 2019

Safe Halloween

Home-School connection strengthens as families participate in Halloween STEAM science activities.

October 2019

Student Led Conferences

Home-School connection strengthens as parents/student review academic achievement and set goals for 2nd semester.

January 2020

STEAMpiration

Student achievement increases as families participate in science and math related literacy, activities, while also appreciating the Arts.

February 2020

Doughnuts with Dad/Muffins with Mom

Home-School connection increases as parents stay involved. Literacy activities will be modeled with take home activities available.

February 2020 & April 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.**

Reddick-Collier is a host site for a VPK program. All students are fully integrated into the school thus helping them transition to Kindergarten. In addition information is provided to our parents from the Title I Office on the HIPPY (Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters) program.

MCPS provides an Exceptional Student Education Pre-K Program at our schools for eligible 3 thru 5 year olds. All students are fully integrated into the school thus helping them transition to Kindergarten.

Our School coordinates with Childhood Development Services and we offer a Head Start program for 3 thru 5 year olds.

Kindergarten registration kicks off in April and continues throughout the summer.

Marion County Public Schools coordinated with Childhood Development Services Inc. and the Early Learning Coalition to get Pre-K students registered for Kindergarten in April. A school based week long Kindergarten Round Up is planned for the spring and is advertised through community based flyers, letters sent home with current students, and a Connect 5 message sent out. A special 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, and begin to develop one-on-one relationships with students.

Articulations are held for students transitioning from 5th grade to middle school. In addition each student visit their middle school in April each year and meets with the guidance counselor to plan for the transition to 6th grade

<https://www.marionschools.net/Page/50820>

MCPS Psychological Services provides assessment, consultation, progress monitoring, and mental health services to improve the academic and emotional well-being of all students.

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

Reddick-Collier Elementary uses district provided reading and math curriculum as the basis of our tier 1 instruction. Teachers receive professional development that aids in the delivery of this curriculum. Title 1 funds are used to purchase supplemental curriculum items to support tier 1 instruction as well as tier 2 and tier 3 research based interventions to be used in the MTSS process.

The MTSS process is followed at Reddick-Collier Elementary. Students are assessed three times per school year using iReady. iReady data is reviewed following each monitoring session to establish the need for intervention and/or support. The MTSS team meets to discuss and develop interventions on an individualized student basis. Students not proficient in math and/or reading receive targeted interventions that are monitored and graphed for progress monitoring. Fidelity checks are in place to ensure students receive their interventions with regularity. Our synergy team meets monthly to assess tier 1 implementation and address concerns. Our PMP team meets three times a year to monitor all students and adjust interventions for students in the MTSS process.

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.**

Marion County Public Schools implements standards and 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.

#### MCPS School Progression Plan

##### 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. Grouping (whole class, within the grade level, and/or across grade levels) arrangements may include, but are not limited to:
  - (1) Flexible grouping strategies to meet needs of individual students
  - (2) Intervention-based grouping determined by screening, diagnostic, progress monitoring, or other assessments
  - (3) Cooperative grouping
  - (4) Small groups of mixed ability, and like ability
  - (5) Ability grouping for portions of school day
  - (6) Multi-age classes
  - (7) Departmentalization
  - (8) Team teaching within or across grade levels or looping (teacher instructing class for multiple years)
  - (9) Other accelerated options as described in § 1002.3105, Fla. Stat. (2018)
  - (10) Other grouping based on qualification for Exceptional Student Education (ESE) or English Language Learners (ELL) (e.g. inclusion model/support facilitation)

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.**

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.

## Part V: Budget

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instruction: Instructional Activities/Strategies</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instruction: Teaching Informed by Multiple Types of Assessments</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instruction: Instructional Activities/Strategies</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>