

Marion County Public Schools

Marion Oaks Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

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: 7/17/2019

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
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 (47%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Marion Oaks Elementary School

280 MARION OAKS TRL, Ocala, FL 34473

[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	66%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	B

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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dreher, Lisa	Principal	<p>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.</p> <p>Some responsibilities include:</p> <p>Prepare and manage the school's budget and allocated resources</p> <p>Effectively interview, select, coach and evaluate personnel.</p> <p>Manage and administer the instructional program so as to ensure all students the opportunity to learn.</p> <p>Provide leadership and direction for the implementation and evaluation of curriculum and instruction at the school consistent with the District's goals and priorities.</p>
McNulty, Jason	Dean	<p>To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment.</p> <p>Responsibilities include:</p> <p>Assist in the development of guidelines for proper student conduct a policies and procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment.</p> <p>Maintain comprehensive files on each student requiring disciplinary actions and maintain records for audits.</p> <p>Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus and at school-related activities and events during work day.</p> <p>Counsel individual students and, when necessary, make appropriate recommendations for testing, guidance, psychological counseling, or community services.</p> <p>Consider recommendations for student placement in alternative education setting to improve student performance.</p> <p>Supervise student activities on the school campus and at school-related events.</p> <p>Work with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.</p> <p>To work with all stakeholders to create and build a positive school climate and culture.</p>
Attenhofer, Christine	Instructional Coach	<p>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.</p> <p>Responsibilities include:</p> <p>Demonstrate knowledge of current trends in specialty areas and professional development.</p> <p>Demonstrate knowledge of the school's program and levels of teacher skills in delivering the program.</p>
Miller, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	<p>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.</p> <p>Responsibilities include:</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>Assist in development and implementation and assessment of the instructional program.</p> <p>Assist in the administration of the testing program.</p> <p>Assist in establishing vision and mission statement.</p>
Maldonado, Dawn	Instructional Coach	<p>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.</p> <p>Responsibilities include:</p> <p>Demonstrate knowledge of current trends in specialty areas and professional development.</p> <p>Demonstrate knowledge of the school's program and levels of teacher skills in delivering the program.</p>
Soto, Nancy	Assistant Principal	<p>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.</p> <p>Responsibilities include:</p> <p>Assist in development and implementation and assessment of the instructional program.</p> <p>Assist in the administration of the testing program.</p> <p>Assist in establishing vision and mission statement.</p>
Griffin, Jennifer	School Counselor	<p>To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.</p>
Almaguer, Hazel	School Counselor	<p>To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.</p>
Edworthy, Shawna	Other	ESE Staffing Specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/17/2019, Lisa Dreher

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.*

3

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.*

26

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

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 (47%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (37%)
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	128	137	141	157	132	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	843
Attendance below 90 percent	81	68	60	78	60	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398
One or more suspensions	8	29	43	23	25	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
Course failure in ELA	9	16	28	15	2	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Course failure in Math	9	16	28	15	2	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	33	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	32	48	38	38	61	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	275

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	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Monday 7/13/2020

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	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	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
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														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
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		

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	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	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
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														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
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		

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	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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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)						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	42%	44%	-2%	58%	-16%
	2018	42%	46%	-4%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	49%	-14%	58%	-23%
	2018	35%	43%	-8%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	35%	45%	-10%	56%	-21%
	2018	50%	46%	4%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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 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	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 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	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 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	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				

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
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.

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%	0
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%	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	40
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	48
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	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	53
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	49
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.

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 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?

Reflecting on the data areas 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.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If teachers provide differentiated instruction and strategies then student proficiency (including students identified with a federal index below 41%) will increase up to 3% in ELA as measured by FSA and Federal Percent of Points Index by Subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	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 3% in ELA as measured by the FSA.
	SWD Achievement 16% to 19%
	AA Achievement 26% to 29%
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. Teachers will participate in grade level collaboration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence of effectiveness would include classroom walk-through and observations as well as district testing such as QSMA and CSMA, I Ready, and DRA.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide teachers with training in CKLA, I Ready, and Top Score Writing. Teachers will receive training from coaches and from company providers. Success will be based on increased scores. This will be monitored through classroom walk-through, and data chats after assessments in each area; such as QSMA, i-Ready Diagnostic and Progress Monitoring as well as Demand Writing.

Person Responsible Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide opportunities for instructional collaborative planning.
Provide coaching opportunities for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Nancy Soto (nancy.soto@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide targeted feedback based on classroom walk-through.
Specific data chats will be held after QSMA, i-Ready diagnostic and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

Student progress monitoring meetings will occur three times per year; each meeting will be held by grade level specific AP.

Person Responsible Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

PST meetings will be held on an as needed basis.

Person Responsible Rebecca Miller (rebecca.miller@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	If teachers focus on authentic literacy within subject area delivery, then proficiency in Math and Science will increase by 3% as measured by FSA and FSSA.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>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 3% as measured by the state assessment.</p> <p>Math:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *3rd 66% to 69% *4th 54% to 57% *5th 37% to 40% <p>Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *5th 36% to 39%
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:	<p>Resources to be used are 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 41% will receive additional progress monitoring and differentiation as needed.</p> <p>Evidence of effectiveness would include classroom walk-throughs and observations as well as district testing such as QSMA and CSMA and I Ready.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Providing teachers coaching in I Ready and differentiation strategies.
Teachers will receive ongoing training in STEMscopes.

Person Responsible Christine Attenhofer (christine.attenhofer@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide opportunities for instructional collaborative planning. Teachers will be involved in collaborative planning with coaches one day per week. They will work on grade level and subject specific plans. Plans will not only follow district curriculum maps but will also be completed based on student data and student needs. i-Ready data will be used to track and to change student paths when needed.

Person Responsible Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide targeted feedback based on classroom walk-through, data chats and student need analysis.

Person Responsible Nancy Soto (nancy.soto@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide training in the use of Stem scopes and i-Ready support.

Person Responsible Christine Attenhofer (christine.attenhofer@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus	One School, One Team: Making A Difference.
Description and 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.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>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 3% in ELA, Math and Science as measured by FSA and FSSA.</p> <p>ELA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *3rd 42% to 45% *4th 49% to 52% *5th 45% to 48% <p>Math:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *3rd 66% to 69% *4th 54% to 57% *5th 37% to 40% <p>Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *5th 36% to 39%
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 which can be referred to in our Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

Action Steps to Implement

The school will offer resources to parents that are easily accessible from the Guidance Office and through our school website (<https://www.marionschools.net/moe>).

Person Responsible Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

Parents will be offered multiple parent night and training opportunities throughout the school year (refer to Parent and Family Engagement Plan).

Person Responsible Rebecca Miller (rebecca.miller@marion.k12.fl.us)

Information 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.

Person Responsible Nancy Soto (nancy.soto@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.

One School, One Team: Making A Difference

At Marion Oaks Elementary School, we continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
- Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo App, Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00