

Marion County Public Schools

Anthony 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Anthony Elementary School

9501 NE JACKSONVILLE RD, Anthony, FL 32617

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gay Street

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (40%) 2014-15: C (46%)
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, [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.

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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Anthony Elementary School

9501 NE JACKSONVILLE RD, Anthony, FL 32617

[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	51%

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.

Anthony Elementary School will accomplish the highest academic achievement possible for our students while creating a safe and nurturing school and building a community within the school that equips young people in developing skills, habits, and competencies that produce an educated citizenry rooted in healthy, personalized, and productive relationships.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that “all children can learn and succeed”. We will be an exemplary learning community school. We build the foundation of this community through meaningful relationships, relevant and engaging learning, and effective communication. We understand the critical connection between home and school. We challenge ourselves to be champions for all students, expect excellence of one another, carry the banner of positivity, and strive to be a merchant of hope. We believe our success will build lifelong, confident learners, who have the tools necessary for success.

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
Johnson, James	Principal	Oversee all programs and processes at the school level. Principal will have specific emphasis on monitoring school data, and progress of bottom quartile students.
Bradshaw, Sandra	School Counselor	Coordinate the MTSS process from the guidance department. Plays lead role in planning staffings, monitoring MTSS process, and facilitating youth mental health plan.
Raney, Karli	Instructional Coach	Support teachers with tier 1 instruction in all subjects. In addition Coaches will also provide support to the teachers with their tier 2 & 3 interventions as well.
Lenon, Veronica	Instructional Coach	Support teachers with tier 1 instruction in all subjects. In addition Coaches will also provide support to the teachers with their tier 2 & 3 interventions as well.
Thomas, Angel	Assistant Principal	Lead curriculum department, and be the point person for all teachers' curricular needs. Areas of oversight to also include master schedule, master calendar, MTSS process, and staff duty responsibilities.
Smith, Jennifer	Dean	The Dean will be the point person for all things discipline, behavior management, and classroom management. Other duties will include coordination of safety/crisis committee, field trips, and staff duty assignments.

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	54	68	53	89	74	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	15	11	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	7	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	15	9	17	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	29	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	12	24	15	30	39	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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)

33

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/1/2019

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	9	8	7	11	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	2	2	4	11	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	2	3	4	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	9	8	7	11	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	2	2	4	11	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	2	3	4	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	41%	47%	57%	47%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	50%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	53%	47%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	40%	51%	63%	47%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	38%	58%	62%	44%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	49%	51%	27%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	47%	53%	49%	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	54 (0)	68 (0)	53 (0)	89 (0)	74 (0)	63 (0)	401 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 (9)	14 (8)	15 (7)	11 (11)	14 (7)	7 (15)	73 (57)
One or more suspensions	1 (2)	4 (2)	2 (4)	7 (11)	16 (3)	6 (4)	36 (26)
Course failure in ELA or Math	6 (0)	15 (0)	9 (0)	17 (0)	9 (0)	9 (0)	65 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	29 (28)	27 (15)	21 (16)	77 (59)

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	41%	44%	-3%	58%	-17%
	2018	36%	46%	-10%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	49%	-17%	58%	-26%
	2018	36%	43%	-7%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	39%	45%	-6%	56%	-17%
	2018	30%	46%	-16%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	49%	0%	62%	-13%
	2018	34%	48%	-14%	62%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
	2018	42%	47%	-5%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	25%	45%	-20%	60%	-35%
	2018	28%	50%	-22%	61%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	44%	3%	53%	-6%
	2018	42%	49%	-7%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	12	50	53	17	47	42	23				
ELL	33	43		24	31		40				
BLK	26	51	50	23	31	31	23				
HSP	43	52		32	36		44				
WHT	50	63	45	52	44		68				
FRL	35	53	52	33	39	50	38				
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	10	26	28	7	28	33	17				
ELL	30	44		21	25						
BLK	24	28		24	24		33				
HSP	38	36		29	36		36				
WHT	45	27	20	46	46		50				
FRL	31	30	41	30	38	26	39				

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	29	27	21	24						
ELL	29			50							
BLK	32	43		19	41		31				
HSP	57	72		68	56		50				
WHT	49	46	46	51	42	17	57				
FRL	40	47	48	42	37	22	44				

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	50
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	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	42
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	48
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	54
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	43
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.

Our lowest area on the 2019 FSA was overall Math performance. Specifically, our learning gains in Math were particularly low. Some of the factors that contributed to the low performance was the elevated emphasis on ELA due to the fact we fell into the bottom 300. Also, there was a lack of a concrete plan for math intervention within the grade levels. Math learning gains was the only area that we didn't improve from the previous year.

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

The only area that declined from the prior year was the math learning gains. As stated earlier, an added emphasis on ELA improvement, and the lack of a defined math intervention process contributed greatly to the decline from the prior 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 areas with the biggest gaps when compared to the state average is our overall proficiency in both ELA and Math. When looking at the FSA data from the previous year, we knew that we had to make some significant changes to our reading program, specifically our intervention programs, due to the inflated number of students that require tier 2 and 3 services. I believe that this emphasis on our reading MTSS programs led to the substantial increases in our ELA learning gains (+33%). Now, to sustain our momentum and take it to the next level, we have to focus on increasing the overall proficiency numbers. We will do this by focusing on improving tier 1 instruction, and paying special attention to the students that scored a level 2 last year on the FSA.

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

The area that increased the most from the previous year was ELA learning gains, trailed just barely by the learning gains of the bottom 25%. In addition to the extra intervention time afforded to us by being in the bottom 300, we also focused the majority of our PD efforts on improving our teachers' reading instruction, especially in the area of reading intervention. We also closely monitored our MTSS groups to make sure that students were placed appropriately, and receiving the correct intervention to fill their deficits.

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

In looking at the EWS data, the most concerning data is the number of students that we have that represent 2 or more of those indicators. This obviously means that they have more than one barrier that is hindering them from being as prepared as they could possibly be to perform optimally in the classroom.

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

1. Improving in all areas of Math
2. Raise the proficiency percentage in both ELA and Math
- 3.

- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Anthony Elementary School will increase proficiency in English Language Arts
Rationale	We chose ELA proficiency as an overall area of focus because data results indicated that Learning Gains increased in the area of ELA, but proficiency still fell below our goals. After further analyzing the data we realized that inconsistencies in the use of available curriculum, as well as the delivery/implementation of the curriculum, contributed greatly to the problem.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If Anthony Elementary teachers consistently deliver Florida Standards aligned instruction in reading, and provide effective reading interventions, then student proficiency will increase in the following grades as measured by FSA data. Grade 3 proficiency Baseline 45%, Target 50%; Grade 4 proficiency Baseline 34%, Target 45%; Grade 5 proficiency Baseline 41%, Target 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will be provided with professional development in higher-level questioning, student feedback practices, and purposeful ongoing formative assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This year instead of focusing our professional development efforts on implementation of various instructional programs, we are focusing on improving teachers' tier 1 instruction across all subjects and grade levels. Specifically we will focus on higher-level questioning, providing students with quality feedback, and implementation of purposeful formative assessment to drive future instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop professional development plan with leadership team to emphasize tier 1 goals 2. Support teachers with tier 1 goals weekly, during collaboration meetings 3. Monitor effectiveness of implementation using classroom walkthrough observational data and other assessments 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Angel Thomas (angelita.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Anthony Elementary will increase student proficiency and learning gains in Math.
Rationale	After reviewing multiple pieces of data and 3-year FSA trends, root cause analysis reveals that inconsistencies in the implementation of the math curriculum, and a lack of proper intervention of below-level students, contributed to the decrease in all areas of math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>If teachers use data driven instruction, formative assessments and collaborate with leadership to develop and implement interventions, then Math proficiency will increase in the following grades as measured by FSA data.</p> <p>Grade 3 Baseline 53% Target 53% Grade 4 Baseline 36% Target 50% Grade 5 Baseline 26% Target 41%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will be provided with professional development in higher-level questioning, student feedback practices, and purposeful ongoing formative assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This year instead of focusing our professional development efforts on implementation of various instructional programs, we are focusing on improving teachers' tier 1 instruction across all subjects and grade levels. Specifically we will focus on higher-level questioning, providing students with quality feedback, and implementation of purposeful formative assessment to drive future instruction. In addition to these strategies, we will also provide the teachers with a concrete plan for Math intervention to be used daily in their classrooms.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop professional development plan with leadership team to emphasize tier 1 goals 2. Support teachers with tier 1 goals weekly, during collaboration meetings 3. Monitor effectiveness of implementation using classroom walkthrough observational data and other assessments 4. Develop intervention plan specifically for Math to be used by teachers. 5.
Person Responsible	Angel Thomas (angelita.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Anthony Elementary will increase proficiency in all ESSA subgroups that are currently under 41%, specifically SWD and African American Students
Rationale	We chose to specifically address the needs of our Students with Disabilities and African American Students due to the fact that their percentage of proficient students fell below the 41% threshold.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If teachers focus on differentiation during Tier 1 instruction and interventions, then subgroups with a federal index below 41% will increase as follows: SWD from 35% to 38% and AA from 34% to 37% as measured by ESSA Federal Index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	In addition to the professional development given to all teachers to improve overall tier 1 instruction, we will also provide teachers specifically with strategies to use to be able to better differentiate their instruction for the various subgroups that are struggling on campus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe that if teachers do a better job of differentiating their tier 1 instruction, as well as their interventions, to better meet the needs of our students; then overall performance of our struggling subgroups will improve markedly.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop professional development plan with leadership team to emphasize differentiating to meet the needs of our struggling subgroups 2. Support teachers with these goals weekly, during collaboration meetings 3. Monitor effectiveness of implementation using classroom walkthrough observational data and other assessments 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Angel Thomas (angelita.thomas@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.

Anthony will provide an array of opportunities to involve and build positive relationships with parents, families, and the community. AYE will have a volunteer parent/community liaison from our SAC who represents the school at all meetings and events. A variety of survey instruments, parent meetings, newsletters, social media campaigns will be used to solicit input from parents regarding the implementation of Title 1 Program and how Title 1 funds are spent. Surveys will be administered to the parents, families, community members at the end of each activity. The results of these surveys will be used to plan ways to increase parental engagement. Additionally, parents will be given opportunities to provide input at the Title 1 Annual Meeting, parent data meetings, parent conferences, Strong Father-Strong Families and parent teacher organization meetings. Anthony will also host a variety of parent, family, and community engagements at the school and at the local community center hosting literacy events, personal development, and social emotional lessons for home.

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.

Lessons are conducted in all classrooms focusing on social-emotional needs and character development via the use of Sanford Harmony. The social worker hosts individual and group sessions provided for students that need additional support with regards to social-emotional needs. We promote school wide social and emotional needs of all students through professional development of our teachers. The school offers Good News Club and Strong Fathers Strong Families which provides mentoring and support for students. In addition, our guidance counselor works as a parent liaison and conducts weekly meetings with school psychologist, speech/vision/hearing, therapists, social workers, and ESE specialist to ensure students' needs are being met.

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 initiative to assist pre-K and 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. Florida's Voluntary PreK, Headstart, and Hippy (Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters) are programs currently implemented throughout the district to assist preschoolers with early literacy skills. Ongoing communication is provided to parents regarding these programs. Federal and state funding is used to provide programs for our preschool children. A Title I Four Year Old Preschool Program is currently in place at the school. The VPK assessments are administered to identify students with low readiness rates, to inform instruction, and to evaluate success of the program. In addition, at the end of the year, our 5th grade ESE students meet with their feeder middle school which includes the guidance counselor and ESE specialist. They learn about their middle school career and set goals for success.

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.

The school leadership team identifies students via data: iReady, DRA, FSA, classroom tests and observations. The schedule allows us to meet with with groups of students for two - 45 minute MTSS

sessions for Tier 2 and 3 instruction. Students are grouped by ability and will receive intensive instruction in their area of need by trained interventionists which includes teachers, paras, and literacy coach. Students will receive Tier 1 instruction throughout the day. All teachers and instructional para-professionals utilize their time working with students during student time on campus using research based intervention programs. Student progress is measured daily. Students making progress are moved immediately. Students needing assistance will require leadership team to host fidelity check of program monthly. Data based decision making for students participating in Tier 2 interventions occurs once a week through coaching conversations between school leaders, interventionists, and teachers, as well as at the end of data cycles (progress monitoring & diagnostics). Once a month, teams work together to determine which students have made enough progress to exit intervention, which students should remain in their current intervention, which students have made insufficient progress, and should be considered for a more intensive level of intervention. Literacy coach will check in/out intervention resources. 2. At AYE, we use the 4-step problem-solving model: Step 1, define, in objective and measurable terms the goal(s) to be attained, Step 2, identify possible reasons why the desired goal(s) is not being attained. Step 3, develop and implement a well-supported plan involving evidence-based strategies to attain the goal(s) Step 4, evaluate the effectiveness of the plan in relation to stated goal. Non-consumable Title I resources, will be bar coded and inventoried annually. Consumables will be maintained in a central location, where administrators and the school secretary will be responsible for distribution of resources.

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. In November, our guidance counselor will host The Great American Teach In wherein community, STEM career based employees, and local businesses showcase their careers. In addition, we will include instructional activities in organization and higher order thinking skill development.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Anthony Elementary School will increase proficiency in English Language Arts	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Anthony Elementary will increase student proficiency and learning gains in Math.	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Anthony Elementary will increase proficiency in all ESSA subgroups that are currently under 41%, specifically SWD and African American Students	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00