

Marion County Public Schools

South Ocala 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	21

South Ocala Elementary School

1430 SE 24TH RD, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Diana Elysee

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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	21

South Ocala Elementary School

1430 SE 24TH RD, 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 PK-5	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

South Ocala Elementary is the desired community school for student-centered learning. Our focus is to provide a family-friendly environment and to develop successful, well-rounded students who will one day become local and global leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Quality teaching and learning at South Ocala Elementary are built on the foundation of a safe, engaging, and dynamic learning environment where instruction is standards-based, data-driven, and differentiated. We uphold high expectations with respect for a diverse community and expect all students to achieve to their highest 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
Callaway, Stephanie	Principal	The principal leads the work across all areas of the 5 Essentials: Ambitious Instruction, Supportive Environments, Collaborative Teachers, Effective Leaders, and Engaged Families. The principal monitors the implementation of high-quality, standards-based instruction and routinely engages stakeholders in examining practice for learning outcomes. The principal is responsible for facilitating a positive culture where excellence and equity are persistent characteristics of the school. She monitors all early warning indicator data and creates strategic plans to eliminate barriers to learning. The principal facilitates the professional development of all stakeholders and expands the capacity of the organization through recruitment and retention practices.
Werhner, Nicole	Instructional Coach	The ELA Content Area Specialist is responsible for monitoring the implementation of ELA standards and highly effective pedagogy for literacy instruction. She is responsible for ELA materials, resources, and lesson planning. The ELA CAS monitors the implementation of the district and school K-5 Reading Plan and MTSS toward proficiency for all students.
Brown, Alicia	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor is responsible for implementing the school-wide guidance program and monitoring students' academic, social, and emotional adjustment through MDT. She facilitates problem-solving meetings, attendance CST meetings, and IEP meetings. The Guidance Counselor assists in the implementation the Sanford Harmony SEL curriculum and supports trauma-informed instruction.
Harris, Glen	Dean	The dean is responsible for school-wide implementation of PBIS and the quality referral process. The dean provides training in MTSS for behavior and enforces the Code of Student Conduct. The dean assists in the creation of classroom management plans and behavior modification plans. He is responsible for check in/out for at-risk students and monitors early warning indicator data to proactively reduce disruptive behaviors and discipline referrals to minimize impact on academic performance.
McConnell, Laurie	Instructional Coach	The Math Content Area Specialist is responsible for monitoring the implementation of Mathematics standards and highly effective pedagogy for mathematics instruction. She is responsible for math materials, resources, and lesson planning. The Math CAS monitors the implementation of the school's plan to improve learning outcomes in mathematics and Math MTSS toward proficiency for all students.
Streater-McAllister, Anna	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal monitors the implementation of high-quality, standards-based instruction and routinely engages stakeholders in examining practice for learning outcomes. The assistant principal facilitates the distribution of instructional materials and technology for yearlong implementation of the instruction and assessment calendar. The assistant principal is responsible for creating the master and intervention schedules.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		She assists in communicating with all stakeholders and works with all leadership team members.
Cabrales, Maria	Instructional Coach	The MTSS instructional coach leads the school in all MTSS process. She creates the intervention schedule and facilitates conversations about students during Progress Monitoring Meetings. The MTSS coach coordinates resources and PD for all interventions. She monitors student's response to interventions and provides support for teachers for fidelity implementation. The MTSS coach monitors lesson plans for "on and beyond" intervention groups and creates iReady intervention groups, including bottom quartile, for routine monitoring.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Diana Elysee

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

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)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	97	103	111	109	114	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	661
Attendance below 90 percent	11	28	24	29	33	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	6	5	7	15	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	4	13	17	6	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in Math	4	11	15	5	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	11	15	18	24	32	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

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	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 8/3/2020

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	104	91	99	122	123	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	19	12	17	20	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	6	2	11	21	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	11	21	8	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	39	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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	14	13	31	41	28	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	104	91	99	122	123	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	19	12	17	20	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	6	2	11	21	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	11	21	8	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	39	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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	14	13	31	41	28	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times		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	54%	47%	57%	49%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	51%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	53%	52%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	51%	63%	42%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	58%	62%	58%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	49%	51%	44%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	47%	53%	55%	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	56%	44%	12%	58%	-2%
	2018	37%	46%	-9%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	49%	3%	58%	-6%
	2018	40%	43%	-3%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	47%	45%	2%	56%	-9%
	2018	46%	46%	0%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	49%	4%	62%	-9%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	54%	7%	64%	-3%
	2018	50%	47%	3%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	49%	45%	4%	60%	-11%
	2018	54%	50%	4%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	44%	8%	53%	-1%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	55%	3%
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	42	44	39	72	65	17				
ELL	31	33		40	58						
BLK	33	43	48	29	59	63	13				
HSP	53	38	30	56	70	50	53				
MUL	50	69		38	50						
WHT	65	58	47	72	69	38	62				
FRL	45	48	48	48	63	54	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	19	10	11	17	10	20	9				
ELL	31			36							
BLK	20	31	29	22	40	23	18				
HSP	45	44		51	48		40				
MUL	37			53							
WHT	48	39	18	64	68	46	82				
FRL	30	31	25	38	49	27	45				
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	16	48	50	28	55	55	60				
BLK	28	41	37	19	46	39	29				
HSP	48	67		50	57						
MUL	90			60							
WHT	58	53	80	51	63	50	68				
FRL	36	47	48	27	48	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	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	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	52
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	
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	59
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.

5th grade ELA at 47% proficient; however, the cohort comparison shows a 7% increase. Impact variable might include two teachers new to the grade level.

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

5th grade Science at a decline of 6%. Fewer students proficient in ELA, which might correlate to reading in the sciences. The school did not have a Science coach this year to support teaching and learning.

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.

5th grade math at 49% compared to state at 60% proficient. The rate of change found in cohort comparison is -1%. One new teacher to the grade level/subject area.

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

3rd grade ELA. Effective Tiers of instruction.

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

Attendance
Academic Adjustment

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

1. Improving student performance through differentiated instruction and effective use of formative/summative assessment data. Use data and routine collaboration to examine past and future practice for efficacy.
2. Fidelity implementation of PBIS.
3. Facilitate professional development and examination of practice to improve equitable learning outcomes for black students proportionate to proficiency rates of white students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Effective use of formative and summative data, along with highly effective pedagogy for differentiated instruction, is the primary area of focus for school improvement. The delivery of differentiated instruction as part of the Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS) ensures that deficits are eliminated/reduced so that every students shows mastery of grade level standards and makes a years growth in a years time.

Measurable Outcome: If teachers effectively use formative and summative assessment data to strategically plan differentiated instruction, then learning outcomes, as measured by FSA, FCAT Science, and iReady will show:
 (1) more than 60% of students will achieve proficiency (2019 SY 54%)
 (2) more than 65% of students will make a learning gain (2019 SY 59%)
 (3) more than 55% of bottom quartile students will make a learning gain (2019 SY 48%)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Educators will participate in yearlong PLC book studies about differentiated instruction selected from the GALE resources. Educators will participate in bi-weekly collaborative conversations about instructional practice and student performance within MTSS. Educators will routinely analyze performance data to examine the effectiveness of past instruction and to effectively plan future instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and the instructional practice of scaffolding are fundamental characteristics of effective instruction. Teachers must be able to plan instruction that will move a student from one level of understanding to the next and more challenging level. Since students experience learning at different rates and have different needs, teachers must differentiate instruction and learning tasks accordingly.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze student performance data to identify areas of greatest need by grade level, subject, teacher, student, and subgroups.

Person Responsible Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

Yearlong book study with GALE Professional Resources

Person Responsible Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

Yearlong progress monitoring through Tier Talks (PMP/EWI), Data Digs, and Curriculum Chats.

Person Responsible Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

Utilize academic coaches, learning walks, MCIES, and other yearlong collaborations to sustain a focus on differentiated instruction through effective use of formative and summative assessment data.

Person Responsible Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) is an essential pillar of school culture. The district will train a school PBIS team who will subsequently refresh site-based educators on best practices for PBIS. The school PBIS team will routinely meet to analyze Early Warning Indicator (EWI) data and collaborate to reduce barriers to learning.

Measurable Outcome: If school stakeholders routinely apply best practice for PBIS, then student behavior will improve as evidenced in the reduction of level 2 and level 3 discipline referrals by 5%. Consistent school-wide adult behaviors to "teach, model, practice, and reward" school-wide expectations, along with effective Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavioral interventions as part of RtI-B/MTSS, will support student success across all facets of school life.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alicia Brown (alicia.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS relies on historical and contemporary research about behavior modification, student motivation to achieve, and characteristics of positive academic adjustment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Researched-based, supported by district for professional development and fidelity implementation at the school.

Action Steps to Implement

Create and train school site PBIS Team.

Person Responsible Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

Train all stakeholders in school-wide expectations, the Quality Referral Process, and RtI-B/MTSS for behavior.

Person Responsible Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

Routine monitoring of early warning indicator data and MTSS data for students' response to interventions. Plan, Do, Check, Act.

Person Responsible Glen Harris (glen.harris@marion.k12.fl.us)

Align counseling services and supports from MDT.

Person Responsible Alicia Brown (alicia.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Equitable learning outcomes for ALL students - Federal Index: 2019 Federal Index data shows that ALL subgroups at the school are 'at or above' the 41% threshold; however, black students underperform white students by 18%. Intentional and strategic work must occur to reduce or eliminate this gap in performance.

Measurable Outcome: If educators apply MTSS and effectively differentiate instruction to eliminate learning deficits, then black students (2019 SY 41%) will perform within 10% of white students (2019 SY 59%) as measured by FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: 8 Step Problem Solving to address the academic adjustment of black students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Mindset, motivation, and self worth/efficacy are shown in the research to influence academic adjustment and school performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze student performance data to identify areas of greatest need by grade level, subject area, teacher, student, and subgroup. Provide effective professional development to improve supports for students. Utilize GALE professional development resources for improved practice.

Person Responsible Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

Utilize Sanford Harmony for SEL school-wide.

Person Responsible Alicia Brown (alicia.brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

Partner with local business to facilitate a community mentor program and check-in, check-out for at-risk students. The school will also provide check-in, check out for at-risk students.

Person Responsible Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

Yearlong progress monitoring through Tier Talks (PMP/EWI), Data Digs, and Curriculum Chats

Person Responsible Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@marion.k12.fl.us)

Utilize academic coaches, learning walks, MCIES, and other yearlong collaborations to sustain a focus on effective practice for proportionate performance among black students.

Person Responsible Stephanie Callaway (stephanie.callaway@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: Differentiation	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00