Marion County Public Schools

Marion Oaks Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

3
4
7
10
15
19
21

Marion Oaks Elementary School

280 MARION OAKS TRL, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Dreher

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2019

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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (37%) 2014-15: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	ormation*
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	<u>Cassandra Brusca</u>
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

Marion Oaks Elementary School

280 MARION OAKS TRL, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Gr (per MSID F		2018-19 Title I School	Disadvan	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S PK-5	chool	Yes		100%
Primary Servic (per MSID F	• •	Charter School	(Report	O Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General Ed	ducation	No		68%
School Grades Histo	ry			
Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16

D

В

D

School Board Approval

Grade

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

C

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.

Marion Oaks Elementary School seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for all students, through developmentally appropriate and ambitious instruction, that allows for individual differences and learning style. Each student's success is based upon the school, home and community connection to ensure that each child will become a life-long learner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating lifelong learners that feel safe and inspired.

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
Dreher, Lisa	Principal	To provide visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. Some responsibilities include: Prepare and manage the school's budget and allocated resources Effectively interview, select, coach and evaluate personnel.
McNulty, Jason	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. Responsibilities include: Assist in the development of guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies and procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment. Maintain comprehensive files on each student requiring disciplinary actions and maintain records for audits.
Attenhofer, Christine	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of math, science, and literacy utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning. Responsibilities include: Demonstrate knowledge of current trends in specialty areas and professional development. Demonstrate knowledge of the school's program and levels of teacher skills in delivering the program.
Miller, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	To aid the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school. Responsibilities include: Assist in development and implementation and assessment of the instructional program. Assist in the administration of the testing program. Assist in establishing vision and mission statement.
Maldonado, Dawn	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of math, science, and literacy utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning. Responsibilities include: Demonstrate knowledge of current trends in specialty areas and professional development. Demonstrate knowledge of the school's program and levels of teacher skills in delivering the program.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Tommi		The instructional coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of math, science, and literacy utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning. Responsibilities include: Demonstrate knowledge of current trends in specialty areas and professional development. Demonstrate knowledge of the school's program and levels of teacher skills in delivering the program

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	133	142	140	125	144	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	841
Attendance below 90 percent	33	32	23	13	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	5	22	29	10	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in ELA or Math	14	17	33	6	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	56	78	177	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311

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

Indicator					Gr	ade	Le	vel						Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	20	23	44	23	25	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	209

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator		Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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)

66

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/25/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	70	69	46	54	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	331	
One or more suspensions	9	7	7	5	18	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	13	32	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	83	109	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	lotai
Students with two or more indicators	17	23	32	24	53	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Indicator		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
Attendance below 90 percent	23	70	69	46	54	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	331
One or more suspensions		7	7	5	18	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math		13	32	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide assessment		0	0	83	109	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272

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

Indicator		Grade Level												Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
Students with two or more indicators	17	23	32	24	53	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202

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).

Sala al Crada Campanant		2019		2018				
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State		
ELA Achievement	38%	47%	57%	51%	52%	55%		
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	69%	57%	57%		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	53%	66%	53%	52%		
Math Achievement	53%	51%	63%	41%	52%	61%		
Math Learning Gains	59%	58%	62%	50%	54%	61%		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	49%	51%	48%	43%	51%		
Science Achievement	36%	47%	53%	53%	51%	51%		

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator		Grade Level (prior year reported)								
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total			
Number of students enrolled	133 (0)	142 (0)	140 (0)	125 (0)	144 (0)	157 (0)	841 (0)			
Attendance below 90 percent	33 (23)	32 (70)	23 (69)	13 (46)	22 (54)	27 (69)	150 (331)			
One or more suspensions	5 (9)	22 (7)	29 (7)	10 (5)	11 (18)	25 (9)	102 (55)			
Course failure in ELA or Math	14 (7)	17 (13)	33 (32)	6 (3)	5 (6)	25 (7)	100 (68)			
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	56 (83)	78 (109)	177 (80)	311 (272)			

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	42%	44%	-2%	58%	-16%
	2018	42%	46%	-4%	57%	-15%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%				
Cohort Com	parison					
04	2019	35%	49%	-14%	58%	-23%
	2018	35%	43%	-8%	56%	-21%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%				
Cohort Com	parison	-7%				
05	2019	35%	45%	-10%	56%	-21%
	2018	50%	46%	4%	55%	-5%
Same Grade C	Same Grade Comparison					
Cohort Com	parison	0%			·	

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District District St Comparison		School- State Comparison
03	2019	66%	49%	17%	62%	4%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	62%	-16%
Same Grade C	omparison	20%				
Cohort Com	parison					
04	2019	54%	54%	0%	64%	-10%
	2018	33%	47%	-14%	62%	-29%
Same Grade C	omparison	21%				
Cohort Com	parison	8%				
05	2019	37%	45%	-8%	60%	-23%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	61%	-19%
Same Grade C	omparison	-5%			•	

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		4%				

			SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
05	2019	32%	44%	-12%	53%	-21%
	2018	47%	49%	-2%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Com						

Subgroup Data

		2019	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	16	39	37	30	55	50	15				
ELL	34	46	39	49	60	58	22				
BLK	26	50	38	45	58	38	27				
HSP	38	45	42	52	58	54	31				
MUL	47	75		40	33						
WHT	42	56	52	58	64	55	43				
FRL	38	51	44	51	57	45	34				
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	22	37	29	18	32	19	36				
ELL	35	35	26	26	41	29	35				
BLK	26	25	8	32	33	15	36				
HSP	43	44	30	37	42	27	44				
MUL	54			54							
WHT	49	39	27	45	43	23	62				
FRL	42	38	22	39	41	20	46				
		2017	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS	•	
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	10	52	55	8	44	52	11				
ELL	31	59	56	29	53	47	22				
BLK	48	73	65	30	39	38	57				
HSP	52	67	63	41	54	52	50				
MUL	64	64		43	45						
WHT	50	70	75	46	52	52	54				
FRL	45	67	70	35	47	50	44				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	47
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	40
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	49				
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO				
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%					
Pacific Islander Students					
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students					
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?					
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	49				
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.

ELA proficiency as measured by the FSA performed the lowest with only 38% students demonstrating proficiency by scoring a 3 or higher in the 2018-2019 school year. This has been a trend since 2017 with ELA scores decreasing each year. The contributing factors to this drop include a new reading curriculum, new teachers to the grade level as well as permanent subs in tested grade level.

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

Science proficiency in 5th grade had the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 going from 50% to 36% proficiency. Contributing factors to this decline include delayed start in reciprocal science review and hands-on science activities.

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.

Data shows a significant gap between school and state average in the following areas as measured by FSA: 4th Grade ELA (-23%), 5th Grade ELA (-21%), 5th Grade Math (-23%), and 5th Grade Science (-21%). Science scores have declined each year since 2017. Contributing factors to these gaps include: new reading curriculum, new teachers to the grade level, teachers team taught when scores were higher, but did not this year, and the delayed implementation of hands-on science activities.

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

Data showed the most improvement with students in the Bottom Quartile in both reading (+20%) and math (+27%). After school tutoring that specifically targeted students in the Bottom Quartile was offered twice per week for 10 weeks. Students in the Bottom Quartile received instruction in both reading and math. Students in the bottom Bottom Quartile were assigned a mentor that regularly checked on them and conference with them on their data.

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

Reflecting on the data ares of concern are students with a Level 1 on state wide assessments and attendance.

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

- 1. Increase reading proficiency.
- 2. Increase quality and rigorous instruction.
- 3. Increase hands on science opportunities.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Instruction: Instructional activities/strategies
Rationale	If teachers provide differentiated instruction and strategies then student proficiency (including students identified with a federal index below 41%) will increase up to 5% in ELA as measured by FSA and Federal Percent of Points Index by Subgroup
State the measurable outcome the school plans to	If teachers focus on differentiation during Tier 1 instruction and the MTSS block in order to meet our students where they are, then proficiency will increase for Students with Disabilities and African American students by 5% in ELA as measured by the FSA. SWD Achievement
achieve	16% to 21%
	AA Achievement 26% to 31%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will participate in Professional Development Opportunities that will help them to implement CKLA, i-Ready, and Top Score Writing with fidelity, Teacher will participate in grade level collaboration twice a week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	CKLA, i-Ready, Top Score Writing Evidence of effectiveness would include include classroom walk-through and observations as well as district testing such as QSMA and CSMA, i-Ready, DRA,
Action Step	
Description	 Providing teachers with training in CKLA, i-Ready, and Top Score Writing. Provide opportunities for collaborative planning. Provide targeted feedback based on classroom walk-throughs Progress monitoring meetings will occur three times per year to monitor student progress. PST meetings will be held on an as needed basis.
Person Responsible	Rebecca Miller (rebecca.miller@marion.k12.fl.us)

40	
#2	
Title	Instruction-Instructional activities/strategies
Rationale	If teachers focus on authentic literacy within subject area delivery, then proficiency in Math and Science will increase by %5 as measured by FSA and FSSA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If teachers focus on authentic literacy during Math and Science block by having students read, write, and talk about Math and Science, along with the hands-on learning, then Math and Science proficiency will increase by 5% as measured by the state assessment. Math: *3rd 66% to 71% *4th 54% to 59^ *5th 37% to 42% Science: *5th 36% to 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rebecca Miller (rebecca.miller@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will utilize i-Ready as a tool for differentiation in math and Stemscopes in science. Students with disabilities will receive additional support in math and science through the support of the inclusion teacher as measured by their IEP.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	i-Ready, Stemscopes, Nat Geo, and GoMath Students with disabilities will receive additional support in math through the support of the inclusion teacher as measured by their IEP. Student with a federal index of below 40% will receive additional progress monitoring and differentiation as needed. Evidence of effectiveness would include classroom walk-throughs and observations as well as district testing such as QSMA and CSMA and i-Ready.
Action Step	
Description	 Providing teachers in i-Ready and differentiation strategies Provide opportunities for collaborative planning. Provide targeted feedback based on classroom walk-throughs Provide training in the use of Stemscopes.
Person Responsible	Christine Attenhofer (christine.attenhofer@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Process-Parent Training
Rationale	Our vision is to create lifelong learners that feel safe and inspired. Research suggests that when parents are involved with their child's school, not only will they child feel successful but the community as a whole,
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If Marion Oaks Elementary provides families with effective tools and strategies that can be used to extend learning into the home then student proficiency will increase by 5% in ELA, Math and Science as measured by FSA. ELA: *3rd 42% to 47% *4th 49% to 54% *5th 45% to 50% Math: *3rd 66% to 71% *4th 54% to 59^ *5th 37% to 42% Science: *5th 36% to 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence- based Strategy	If we provide parents with meaningful strategies and activities then parents will be able to implement the strategies at home in order to help students succeed. This will give them tools and strategies that will allow them to academically help their children at home. This will support what is taught at school and potentially impact student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy	Parents will be given multiple opportunities to participate in parent trainings and parent engagement nights. Parents will be offered a variety of parent nights and trainings. Events that will be included this year are: Publix Math Night, Fall Family Reading and Math Night, ESE Parent Night, Literacy on the Lawn, and Science Exploration Night.
Action Step	
Description	 The school will offer resources to parents that are easily accessible in the front lobby. Parents will be offered multiple parent night and training opportunities throughout the school year. Information to parents will be disseminated out to parents in a variety of ways in both English and Spanish in a variety of different ways such as: Skylerts, parent newsletters, school website and other various forms of social media. Refer to site-based Parent and Family Engagement Plan within the Title I Requirements for additional details. Second to the parent and Family Engagement Plan within the Title I Requirements for additional details.
Person Responsible	Rebecca Miller (rebecca.miller@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

N/A

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

Parent & Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) Goal: If Marion Oaks Elementary provides families with effective tools and strategies that can be used to extend learning into the home then student proficiency will increase by 5% in

ELA, Math and Science as measured by FSA.

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; MOE will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Title I Annual Meeting

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

September 2019

Dads Take Your Child to School DayThis initiative highlights the significant positive impact that fathers, father figures and male role models have when taking an active role in a child's education.

September 25, 2019

Publix Math Night

Provide fun math real-world engagement activities for students to share in with their families.

October 2019

Fall Family Reading/Math Night

To provide reading and math literacy support, tools, and strategies to parents.

November 2019

ESE Parent Night

To provide parents of students with disabilities the opportunity to learn how to advocate for their children and what agencies/supports are available to those students and their families.

January 2020

Literacy on the LawnTo provide an opportunity for parents to engage in literacy activities with their child. February 2020

Science Exploration Night

To engage KG-5th grade students and their families in science exploration activities and share their STEAM Showcase projects.

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.

MOES currently houses three Voluntary Prekindergarten Programs for Developmentally Delayed students, as well as, two Title I VPK programs. Communication between Pre-K and Kindergarten occurs regularly. Articulation meetings are held towards the end of the year for those Developmentally Delayed students. These meetings may consist of the student, parents, ESE Specialist, School Psychologist, General Education Teacher, ESE Teacher, School Counselor, Assistant Principal and/or Principal. Something new we have started this year is that all 4th and 5th grade students will attend their IEP meetings to self-advocate for what they need in regards to accommodations.

Fifth grade students are invited to participate in a field-trip to the middle school, so that they have a chance to become acquainted with their new school. The Principal of the middle school, usually provides a tour of the school, shares expectations, describes programs that are available, answers questions and offers support to the students, in an effort to ease their anxiety before the first day of school.

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

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

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

Talking to Children About Violence: Tips for Parents and Teachers

Bullies and Victims: A Primer for Parents

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

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

Helping Children Cope With Traumatic Events

Trauma Informed Care Resources

Suicide Prevention - 13 Reasons Why: Information Sheet and Resource Guide

Prevensión del Suicidio Juvenil: Consejos para Padres y Educadores

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

The Synergy Team meets quarterly, throughout the school year, to discuss the progress of students in the Tier

II and Tier III process, as well as, any Tier I instructional support needs. The Leadership Team focuses weekly on the implementation of our Tier I core curriculum. Student data collected that was current and relevant will be utilized to make informed, academic decisions for classroom instruction and student progress toward academic growth.

At the close of the school year, the Literacy Content Area Specialist provides a reading screening for all students, in order to provide students with a necessary intervention. Student data is also reviewed for interventions in math by the intervention teacher. Students are grouped in classes by reading needs, according to the screening, based on what intervention program would most benefit them. The team aligns resources, both materials and personnel, to where the needs are. A schedule is created to ensure adequate personnel are available to support the students in need. Every decision made is based on individual student data from the reading and/or math interventions being provided.

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.

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 resulting in highest impact.

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.

	1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instruction: Instructional activities/strategies	\$0.00
:	2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instruction-Instructional activities/strategies	\$0.00

•	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Process-Parent Training	\$0.00
		Total:	\$0.00