

Marion County Public Schools

# Shady Hill Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# 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: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

## 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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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	41%

### School Grades History

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

Our mission at Shady Hill is to create an 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Riedl, Debra	Principal	The principal oversees the day to day operations of the school. The principal also supports teachers and staff with curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning
Steinke, Amber	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports teachers and staff with curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning.
Sprung, Lisa	School Counselor	Our school counselor supports students, parents and staff with addressing students' immediate and long-term needs. (food, clothing, services, mental health, etc.)
Catalanotto, Susan	Dean	Our Student Services Manager develops and supports a school-wide positive behavior system and handles student discipline. She also puts into place processes and procedures that support student safety on campus.
Amodeo, Francine	Instructional Coach	Our Content Area Specialist supports teachers and students with the delivery of ELA curriculum.
Albright, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Our Title I Intervention Teacher delivers Tier II and Tier III interventions to students in grades K-5.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Anna Streater Mcallister

**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.*

5

**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.*

30

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

44

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	



<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	84	95	104	104	109	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	14	20	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	4	5	5	6	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	0	9	18	14	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	3	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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

Thursday 7/16/2020

### 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	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

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

**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	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

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

## 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	
	(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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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%	0
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%	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	34
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	60
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	70
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	64
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	52
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 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?**

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 or 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 Learning Gains in African American students
3. Improve behavior noted in the Early Warning System (EWS) for students with more than 3 referrals in a school year.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:****#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Instruction - Higher level questioning and academic discussion: 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.

**Measurable Outcome:** 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. (I Ready, QSMA, FSA)

**Action Steps to Implement**

Meet with leadership team over the summer and develop a year-long PD plan using the Rigor and Relevance Framework. Each team member designs a training to implement on a PD day throughout the year.

**Person Responsible** Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor strategies and provide feedback to teachers throughout the year. Strategies will be monitored in online classes as well as face-to-face classes.

**Person Responsible** Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor student data throughout the year during collaboration meetings. Looking at Component 3b in the instructional evaluation rubric related to students questioning, collect data during observations and evaluations. Use data to drive professional development focus.

**Person Responsible** Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)



**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Instruction - Higher level questioning and academic discussion: 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.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	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%)
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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%.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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 Steps to Implement**

Intervention teacher will provide Tier II and Tier III interventions to students and monitor progress.

**Person Responsible** Amber Steinke (amber.steinke@marion.k12.fl.us)

The use of higher level questioning and academic discussion strategies will be implemented across all classrooms. Consistent feedback will be provided to teachers.

**Person Responsible** Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

Questioning strategies will be utilized during the CKLA ELA block as well as during interventions.

**Person Responsible** Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Instruction - Higher level questioning and academic discussion: 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.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	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.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will implement Sanford Harmony Social intervention, while incorporating higher-level questioning and student discussion.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Higher-level questioning and discussion will increase student engagement, which will decrease student discipline occurrences. The Sanford Harmony curriculum will assist students in handling with difficult social interactions.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Sanford Harmony lessons will be modeled for teachers during the first two weeks of school and throughout the year as needed.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Sprung (lisa.sprung@marion.k12.fl.us)

Fidelity checks will be completed to ensure that a morning meet up, as well as a Sanford Harmony Social Emotional lessons take place each day in all classrooms.

**Person Responsible** Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

Social Emotional learning will be a focus as students return to school after Distance Learning. The focus will be ongoing.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Sprung (lisa.sprung@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students who are at-risk will be placed in a small group where the instruction is tailored to their needs. (anger management, self-improvement, etc.)

**Person Responsible** Lisa Sprung (lisa.sprung@marion.k12.fl.us)

The multi-disciplinary team will meet monthly to discuss student needs and develop and monitor ongoing plans for students. (This will include: Principal, Asst. Principal, School Counselor, Social Worker, Student Services Manager, School Psychologist, Behavior Technician)

**Person Responsible** Lisa Sprung (lisa.sprung@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.

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 and/ or 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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00