Shady Hill Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Shady Hill Elementary School

5959 S MAGNOLIA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Anna Streater Mcallister

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: B (59%)
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

Shady Hill Elementary School

5959 S MAGNOLIA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

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

Our mission at Shady Hill is to create and environment where ALL children, regardless of differences, will be able to succeed academically, physically, and emotionally to their maximum ability.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a positive, family-oriented and engaging environment where children will recognize and achieve their fullest potential.

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
Riedl, Debra	Principal	Oversees day to day operations of the school. Supports teachers and staff with curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning
Steinke, Amber	Assistant Principal	Supports teachers and staff with curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning
Sprung, Lisa	School Counselor	Lisa Sprung - Supports students, parents and staff with addressing students' immediate and long-term needs. (flood, clothing, services, mental health, etc.)
Catalanotto, Susan	Dean	Dossella Elder - Develops and supports a school-wide positive behavior system and handles student discipline. Puts into place processes and procedures that support student safety on campus.
	Instructional Coach	Francine Amodeo - Supports teachers and students with the delivery of ELA curriculum.

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	102	97	94	128	113	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	663
Attendance below 90 percent	7	12	7	7	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	2	6	6	4	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	16	12	22	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	41	31	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	24	19	33	27	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
45

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/16/2019

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	18	11	7	12	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	2	8	14	20	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	15	28	5	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	22	23	36	38	36	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200

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	18	11	7	12	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	2	8	14	20	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	15	28	5	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	22	23	36	38	36	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200

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	57%	47%	57%	61%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	56%	58%	62%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	53%	46%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	51%	63%	62%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	58%	62%	62%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	49%	51%	47%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	47%	53%	57%	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	102 (0)	97 (0)	94 (0)	128 (0)	113 (0)	129 (0)	663 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (18)	12 (11)	7 (7)	7 (12)	11 (12)	17 (9)	61 (69)
One or more suspensions	2 (2)	6 (8)	6 (14)	4 (20)	9 (16)	8 (13)	35 (73)
Course failure in ELA or Math	7 (16)	16 (15)	12 (28)	22 (5)	7 (8)	9 (10)	73 (82)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	41 (23)	31 (26)	39 (19)	111 (68)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	51%	44%	7%	58%	-7%	
	2018	65%	46%	19%	57%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison		-14%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	58%	49%	9%	58%	0%	
	2018	56%	43%	13%	56%	0%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison		-7%					
05	2019	52%	45%	7%	56%	-4%	
	2018	57%	46%	11%	55%	2%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison		-4%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	59%	49%	10%	62%	-3%	
	2018	68%	48%	20%	62%	6%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	75%	54%	21%	64%	11%	
	2018	58%	47%	11%	62%	-4%	
Same Grade Comparison		17%					
Cohort Comparison		7%					
05	2019	59%	45%	14%	60%	-1%	
	2018	65%	50%	15%	61%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	53%	44%	9%	53%	0%	
	2018	59%	49%	10%	55%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison							

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	41	29	40	61	52	36				

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	29	30		59	85						
BLK	22	40	29	38	51	38	20				
HSP	54	57	45	70	77	75	52				
MUL	68	75		68	80		60				
WHT	68	61	48	76	73	52	69				
FRL	40	53	49	53	64	53	40				

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	21	33	26	20	30	22	17				
ELL	38			38							
BLK	27	33	36	41	39	39	23				
HSP	59	61	58	61	56		60				
MUL	68	57		72	50						
WHT	67	55	40	69	53	27	69				
FRL	48	46	39	52	45	37	51				

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	25	40	38	17	34	35	12				
ELL	44	50		56	50						
BLK	24	38	39	24	41	45	12				
HSP	58	57		68	54		44				
MUL	79	85		74	85						
WHT	71	69	53	70	69	40	72				
FRL	48	54	44	50	56	44	38				

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	57
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
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	60
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	70
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	
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	64
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	52
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 bottom quartile Learning Gains showed the lowest performance at 44%. This is a 3% increase from last year. We contribute the increase to the fact that our Tier II and Tier III interventions were in place and research-based programs were being utilized. There is a need to increase opportunities for students to have text and questions in front of them daily, as well as opportunities to read out loud, in addition to scripted phonics interventions.

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

Science showed the greatest decline going from 59% proficient to 56% proficient. Additional training opportunities in 5th grade Science will be available. Support and assistance setting up Science labs will also be provided.

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.

Overall ELA proficiency was right at the state average of 57%. However, Grade 5 ELA had the largest gap when compared to state averages. Shady Hill was 4% below the state average. (SHE - 52%/State - 56%) This was our first year with the implementation of a new Phonics program in grades K-2. Before implementation, the delivery of Phonics instruction varied from classroom to classroom in grades K-2, which may have had a negative impact on 3-5 ELA scores.

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

Math Learning Gains and bottom quartile Math learning gains each increased by 20%. Grade/Team level collaboration was built into the schedule daily. There was consistent and ongoing collaboration which resulted in teachers looking at data and planning together accordingly. Whole group and centers were utilized in Math with a major focus on reteaching and remediation for our lowest students in a small group with the teachers.

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

Areas of concern are students with multiple warnings, specifically in grades 4 and 5. Most of these students have course failures and level 1 on statewide assessments. Our number of students scoring a level 1 has increased. Many of these students are also listed for having three of more discipline referrals in a year.

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

1. Increase overall ELA proficiency
2. Increase LG in African American students
3. Improve behavior noted in the EWS for students with more than 3 referrals in a school year.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Instruction - Higher level questioning and academic discussion
Rationale	Research has shown that high-level questioning and academic discussion support critical thinking and problem-solving. This will lead to student engagement and an increase of higher-level thinking, ultimately leading to increased student achievement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Goal #1 - If all core teachers incorporate higher level questioning and student discussion using the rigor and relevance framework, into their academic instruction, then ELA proficiency will increase from 57% to 60% as measured by the 2019-2020 FSA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Content Area Specialist - English Language Arts -Assist with the delivery of Professional Development - Use of Bill Daggett's Rigor and Relevance framework as a basis for Professional Development (focusing on high-level questioning and academic discussion) -Work with all teachers to build capacity in the area of reading (providing support, resources, and modeling)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Content - Area Specialist will assist in building capacity in teachers by providing relevant evidence-based Professional Development, providing additional support and services to teacher, and by modeling evidence-based strategies in the classroom. Evidence would include classroom observation data, walk-through data, as well as ELA proficiency data. (iReady, QSMA, FSA)

Action Step	
Description	1. Meet with Reading Leadership Team to discuss goals for the year. 2. Attend 3-day Rigor and Relevance Training 3. Create PD Plan for the year including area of focus (high-level questioning and academic discussion) 4. Create short and long-terms goals for teacher and student outcomes 5. Monitor and follow up with all PD and with Reading Leadership Team
Person Responsible	Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Instruction - Higher level questioning and academic discussion
Rationale	Research has shown that high-level questioning and academic discussion support critical thinking and problem-solving. This will lead to student engagement and an increase of higher-level thinking, ultimately leading to increased student achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Goal #2 - If teachers provide differentiated instruction for higher level questioning and academic discussion, then student proficiency identified with a federal index below 41% in the area of ELA will increase by 5% as measured by the 2019-2020 FSA assessment scores. (From 34% to 39%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will provide differentiated lessons using the CKLA reading series. An intervention teacher along with the assistance of a paraprofessional will provide targeted research-based interventions to students identified through the federal index below 41%.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using research-based interventions with fidelity provided by an intervention teacher will maximize differentiated learning opportunities for our students and increase student performance. Evidence would include classroom observation data, walk-through data, as well as ELA proficiency data. (iReady, QSMA, FSA)

Action Step	
Description	1. Use data to determine which students will be targeted in explicit small group/ individual intervention. 2. Assemble intervention groups 3. Provide training to teachers providing intervention 4. Monitor interventions and ensure there is fidelity with the delivery. 5. Track student progress
Person Responsible	Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Instruction - Higher level questioning and academic discussion
Rationale	Research has shown that high-level questioning and academic discussion support critical thinking and problem-solving. This will lead to student engagement and an increase of higher-level thinking, ultimately leading to increased student achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Goal #3 -If we incorporate higher level questioning and student discussion into the Sanford Harmony Social Intervention program then student engagement will increase while discipline occurrences (3 or more within a year) will decrease from 9% to 5% of students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will implement Sanford Harmony Social intervention, while incorporating higher-level questioning and student discussion.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Higher-level questioning and discussion will increase student engagement, which will decrease student discipline occurrences. The Sanford Harmony curriculum will assist students in handing with difficult social interactions.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide training to teachers on Sanford Harmony 2. Provide ongoing professional development on higher-level questioning and discussion strategies 3. Follow-up after each PD will occur by administration 4. Progress monitor behavior for identified students 5.
Person Responsible	Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@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).

There is a need to increase proficiency and learning gains in our African American students, as well as decrease behavior incidences in students identified in the Early Warning systems. We will address these concerns by providing interventions and tracking progress of our students. An increase in higher-level questioning and student discussion will result in increased student engagement, which will increase proficiency and decrease behavior incidences.

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.

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders through activities that engage the whole family. We will host several face-to-face activities such as: Meet the Teacher, Open House, Fall Festival, STEAM Showcase, Strong Fathers/Strong Families, Family Reading Night, Publix Math Night, Holiday Extravaganza, Spring Fling, Career Fair, etc. The Career Fair offers community stakeholders and opportunity to showcase their businesses and offers students real-world experiences. Parents will also have the opportunity to attend School Advisory Committee Meetings as well as PTA meetings.

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.

Our school, like other schools in our county has a problem-solving team that meets regularly to discuss the needs of our students. In order for students to learn, their social emotional needs must be met. The team may consist of the Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist, Behavior Specialist, Dean of Students, Social Worker, and often times the Speech/Language Pathologist or other related service specialist. If a student has a need often times the Problem Solving Team meets to discuss how to best help the student, or the Guidance Counselor may speak to the student. The Guidance Counselor may bring in the Assistant Principal or other members of the team as needed. Our Social Worker is used to visit homes and offer resources that may help the child's social-emotional needs be met. Collectively, we help to provide services and assistance to families whose children need assistance. The strong communication skills of the team is the key ingredient to helping students. "Project About School Safety" (PASS) is a new program that will provide preventive mental health services to our students as a collaborative effort within the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). This program is part of the ISF grant through the University of Florida. The goal of this school-community collaborative model is to improve school climate and safety, reduce discipline problems, reduce exposure to bullying, and improve student mental health and behavioral health.

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

Kindergarten registration is kicked off in April continued 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 Skylert message sent out. STAGGER START is a district initiative to assist kindergarten students in transitioning into local elementary schools. The primary focus of stagger start is to give the staff the opportunity to administer assessments, including FLKRS, and begin to develop one-on-one relationships with students.

Students who transfer to us within the district are easily monitored using systems we have in place that are consistent from school to school. Data is transferred in Unify, Skyward and through our Student Management System. When schools receive records, we have additional progress monitoring data (I-Ready, DRA) that assists us in making placement decisions for students. School administrators also network in order to provide consistent instruction to students.

Outgoing fifth grade students participate in an orientation hosted by the school. Area middle schools make an on-sight visit to provide students with supports and information on the middle school curriculum

and format. In addition, we take an on-sight visit to an area middle school to help our student become familiar with the campus.

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.

Shady Hill Elementary School has a leadership team that consists of the Principal, Asst. Principal, Student Services Manager, Guidance Counselor, Instructional Coaches, and the Media Specialist. The Multi-Disciplinary Team consists of all of the above members with the addition of: ESE Specialist, School Psychologist, School Behavior Specialist and Behavior Tech, Classroom teachers, and the School Social Worker. Parents are invited to attend problem-solving meetings for their children. Through these meetings, the leadership teams look at multiple sources of data to make instructional decisions as it relates to academics as well as social/emotional health. Teams look at baseline data, target specific students for assistance in any area and design a plan for individual or groups of students. Appropriate resources such as interventions, behavior support, counseling, goal-setting are put into place for students. Data is monitored and followed-up with at each subsequent meeting, as well as in between with teachers and parents included. Title I funds are used to purchased interventions for students. Additional funds come from state to target and improve Mental Health in Schools. Funds will be used for a Mental Health screener as well as Social/Emotional curriculum.
Title I Part A –
Title I will fund Content Area Specialists (CAS) in Literacy, Math and Science. CAS` serve specific identified schools as instructional coaches for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialists serve as intervention specialists for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content.
Title I funds will also be utilized to subsidize the presence of intervention paraprofessionals in classrooms. Under the direction and guidance of classroom teachers, they will help implement targeted interventions for identified students including before and after school tutoring. This aligns with our district`s multi-tiered systems of support.

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

Shady Hill participates in Career Day in the fall. Community members from various organization come in to speak to students about future careers. Additionally, Shady Hill has two business partners who work with the school to provide resources and materials for students. Business partners are invited to the school and to the School Advisory meetings.