College Park Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

College Park Elementary School

1330 SW 33RD AVE, Ocala, FL 34474

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Teresa Forsyth

Start Date for this Principal: 6/4/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (42%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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

College Park Elementary School

1330 SW 33RD AVE, Ocala, FL 34474

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 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	83%

School Grades History

Year	**2019-20**	**2018-19**	**2017-18**	**2016-17**
Grade	C	C	D	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 College Park Elementary School is to provide all students with the educational opportunities needed to develop academic skills and character traits necessary for a diverse and global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at College Park Elementary is to provide a quality education in a safe and nurturing environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Forsyth, Teresa	Principal	Principal: Oversees all school operations and establishes the collaborative culture of the school and its leadership team. Brings together district, school, and community stakeholders in planning, and implementing the SIP. Evaluates effective instructional practices in the classrooms and creates professional development specific to our school needs.
Robles, Noelle	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals: Support instructional vision of the principal, oversee teacher collaborative planning, coordinate scheduling, supervise paraprofessionals, assist guidance department, collect data, monitor MTSS implementation, plan professional development and establish best practices for student growth.
Black, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals: Support instructional vision of the principal, oversee teacher collaborative planning, coordinate scheduling, supervise paraprofessionals, assist guidance department, collect data, monitor MTSS implementation, plan professional development and establish best practices for student growth.
Barton, Rebecca	Dean	Dean: Supports the instructional vision of the principal, assists teachers to establish consistent classroom procedures, maintains behavior data, and supports student academic and social/emotional growth.
Duncan, Lindsay	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaches: Provide professional development and content support, mentor new and developing teachers, model best practices and facilitate learning walks, communicate instructional goals and outcomes with parents and teachers, work with student intervention groups, and support the instructional vision of the principal.
Sadler, Camilla	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaches: Provide professional development and content support, mentor new and developing teachers, model best practices and facilitate learning walks, communicate instructional goals and outcomes with parents and teachers, work with student intervention groups, and support the instructional vision of the principal.
Orange , Lorrie	Other	Intervention Teacher: Working with 3rd grade retainees and bottom quartile students.
Laiz, Noemi	School Counselor	Guidance Counselors: Facilitate MTSS process, support teachers in meeting social/emotional needs of students, monitor student attendance, communicate with parents and students, assist teachers with academic/behavior referral packets, and support the instructional vision of the principal.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/4/2020, Teresa Forsyth

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (42%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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.	

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	53	117	129	117	132	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	10	7	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	1	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	16	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	23	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	61	38	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	53	40	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163

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	8	11	14	14	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/14/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	120	127	103	140	125	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	760
Attendance below 90 percent	32	23	11	22	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	1	7	3	16	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	23	9	25	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	114	78	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329

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	35	28	53	35	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	120	127	103	140	125	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	760
Attendance below 90 percent	32	23	11	22	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	1	7	3	16	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	23	9	25	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	114	78	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329

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	35	28	53	35	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	36%	47%	57%	38%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	56%	58%	51%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	52%	53%	54%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	51%	63%	49%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	58%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	49%	51%	49%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	47%	53%	35%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	28%	44%	-16%	58%	-30%
	2018	39%	46%	-7%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	49%	-6%	58%	-15%
	2018	33%	43%	-10%	56%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	24%	45%	-21%	56%	-32%
	2018	29%	46%	-17%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	38%	49%	-11%	62%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison	-4%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	54%	-2%	64%	-12%
	2018	44%	47%	-3%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison	8%					
Cohort Comparison	10%					
05	2019	29%	45%	-16%	60%	-31%
	2018	25%	50%	-25%	61%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison	-15%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	23%	44%	-21%	53%	-30%
	2018	28%	49%	-21%	55%	-27%
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	16	34	45	23	34	29	4				
ELL	31	52	50	44	56	42	18				
BLK	23	41	72	30	41	44	21				
HSP	40	51	48	47	49	31	29				
MUL	45			18							
WHT	38	55		51	57		37				
FRL	32	48	59	39	49	35	22				
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	17	33	33	27	29	18	20				
ELL	24	41	45	37	27	20	10				
BLK	27	47	31	29	26	28	26				
HSP	36	40	35	40	34	22	31				
MUL	10			30							
WHT	46	54	70	53	35		43				
FRL	32	43	41	38	31	23	28				

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	7	40	46	22	38	43	24				
ELL	24	38	52	45	47	55	13				
BLK	31	59	57	43	48	53	11				
HSP	39	48	54	53	55	54	42				
MUL	45	65		36	47						
WHT	40	48		55	55	30	53				
FRL	33	46	53	46	49	47	31				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	349
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	32
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Science proficiency as measured by the NGSSS Statewide Science Assessment performed the lowest with only 28% of 5th grade students demonstrating proficiency by scoring a 3 or better in the 2018-2019 school year. This continues a downward trend over the last 2 school years representing a drop of 4% from Spring 2018. Contributing factors to this decline were the two continuous subs that we had in fifth grade.

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

Science proficiency as measured by the NGSSS Statewide Science Assessment performed the lowest with only 28% of 5th grade students demonstrating proficiency by scoring a 3 or better in the 2018-2019 school year. Contributing factors to this decline were the two continuous subs that we had in fifth grade.

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.

Fifth grade students performed 36 percent below the state in math proficiency as measure by the Spring FSA Mathematics assessment. Contributing factors to this decline were the two continuous subs that we had in fifth grade

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

Fourth grade showed a 10 percent increase in ELA achievement from Spring 2018. During the double MTSS blocks, students transitioned to different teachers to receive small group interventions based on performance data. During collaborative planning, the teachers worked together to develop standards based instruction to support the needs of all students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The number of referrals increased, raising concern in the area of student discipline resulting from the lack of social emotional skills.

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

1. Standards-based Instruction
2. Small group instruction
3. Social, Emotional Supports

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A downward trend in student achievement in ELA, math, and science, as well as a significant drop in learning gains in 5th grade for both ELA and math as measured by FSA data, demonstrates a weakness in standards-based instructional practice
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers implement effective standards-based instruction in ELA, math, and science, then student learning gains and proficiency in 3rd grade will increase by at least 5% in each area. Learning gains will increase using the following target indicators: Grade 3 Baseline ELA 28% Target 33%, Grade 3 Baseline Math 38% Target 43%, Grade 4 Baseline ELA 43% Target 48%, Grade 4 Baseline Math 52%, Target 57%, Grade 5 Baseline ELA 24% Target 29%, Grade 5 Baseline Math 29%, Target 34%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning using Florida Standards to support standards-based instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was implemented last year and produced adequate learning gains in ELA and Math. Teachers will continue to receive support from Instructional Coaches and Assistant Principals in developing standards-based instruction through the use of academic resources.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule common collaborative planning twice a week to develop standards-based lessons, standards-based learning activities, and standards focus boards in ELA, math, and science.

Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Assistant Principals and Instructional coaches will support teachers in planning and instruction.

Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Develop a space for teachers to access plans, additional resources, and strategies discussed during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A downward trend in student achievement in ELA, math, and science, as well as a significant drop in learning gains in 5th grade for both ELA and math as measured by FSA data, demonstrates a weakness in standards-based instructional practice.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers utilize targeted small-group instruction in ELA, math, and science, then subgroups identified by the Federal Index below 41% will have learning gains increased by at least 5% in each area using the following target indicators; Black/African American Students in ELA 23% to 28%, Math 30% to 35%, Science 21% to 26%; Multi-Racial Students in ELA 25% to 30%, Math 18% to 23% and Students with Disabilities in ELA 16% to 21%, Math 23% to 28% and Science 4% to 9%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on administrator walkthroughs last year, teachers were implementing small group instruction and interventions. While the learning gains increased, there is a need to increase the rigor of the activities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue to build on targeted small group instruction and
interventions with regular progress monitoring to meet specific learning
needs of student subgroups, especially for our Multi-Racial, African-American and ESE student
subgroups.

Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Discipline referrals increased significantly from the previous year.
Measurable Outcome:	If we implement a school-wide SEL curriculum, then students will develop social, emotional skills to help them self-regulate their behavior decreasing the number of Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 referrals by 20%. Level 1 referrals will decrease from 336 to 269, Level 2 474 to 379 and Level 3 15 to 12.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony is a research-based curriculum for SEL.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Discipline data indicated a need for a social, emotional learning curriculum. This program to be evidence based, and successful in other schools.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue to implement the Sanford Harmony program with fidelity.

Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. The Guidance Counselor and Sanford Harmony Champion will continue to provide training to teachers on how to implement Sanford Harmony in their classroom.

Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs on Sanford Harmony to support teachers.

Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

If we provide capacity building strategies to parents and families that address and promote family engagement in ELA, Math, and Science, then we will see increased learning gains for intermediate students and increased foundational skills in the primary grades as measured by local assessment and data.

Our site-based PFEP will describe our commitment to engage parents and families in the education of their children and to build the capacity to implement family engagement strategies and activities designed to achieve the school and student academic achievement goals. Through the following capacity building events; we 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 our school-wide participation and of its link to student achievement.
August 2020

Strong Fathers Math
Parents, particularly fathers, will discover fun ways to help their students with math at home.
January 2021

Spooky Story Night/Winter Story Night
All families will celebrate cultures and we will model literature activities that help them to see how we are unique and yet the same.
October 2020/December 2020

Orlando Science Night
Families will learn how they can engage their children in learning about science at home.
November 2020

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00