East Marion Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

East Marion Elementary School

14550 NE 14TH STREET RD, Silver Springs, FL 34488

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Dobbs

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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.](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

East Marion Elementary School

14550 NE 14TH STREET RD, Silver Springs, FL 34488

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2019-20 Title I School

Yes

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

100%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

19%

School Grades History

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

The mission at East Marion Elementary (EME) is to work within our school community to create an environment which encourages our students to take ownership of their learning with the end goal for all students to become critical thinkers, problem solvers and life-long learners as a result of rigorous and effective instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At East Marion Elementary (EME), our purpose for the future of our students, is to work with all stakeholders in order to provide and support a safe learning environment that delivers relevant instruction for all students. As part of that vision we will focus on including purposeful, authentic learning opportunities which will allow all students to apply what they have learned as it relates to "real world" and the resulting impact of their learning has on their choices for the future.

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
Borge-Shaffer, Deborah	Principal	As the instructional leader of the school, the principal will strive to guide the use of data-based decision–making, progress monitor all tiered groups of intervention, strategically plan professional development opportunities for all staff members based on teacher need, provide collaborative opportunities, allocate personnel/material resources strategically, and conduct scheduled evaluative observation of instructional delivery, Most importantly the principal will work toward building a strong school community where relationship building is the foundation of our school culture as it relates to the academic, behavioral, and social emotional success of all students.
Laplante, Allison	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
D'Esposito, Kerrie	Dean	The Student Services Manager (SSM) implements procedures and policies on campus to ensure a safe and orderly learning environment. She provides interventions for student disciplinary and behavior issues, develops appropriate programs to promote positive behavior and facilitates professional development for faculty and staff to support proper classroom management and school safety. The SSM designs short and long-range plans related to student discipline and school safety using current research, performance data, and feedback from staff, students, parents, and community-based agencies. She serves as a liaison to the MCSO School Resource Officer and coordinates the safety committee. The SSM acts as the Lead Instructional Talent Developer and coordinates the mentoring and induction program for the new and early career teachers.
Nieb, Heather	School Counselor	The School Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for social emotional learning; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Rivera, Stephanie	School Counselor	The School Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for social emotional learning; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Mobley, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Pawlowski, Chelsea	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Mathematics and Science, provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/6/2020, Sarah Dobbs

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.*

0

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

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* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	61	105	96	101	92	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	19	51	45	41	28	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217
One or more suspensions	0	17	7	12	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	7	4	19	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	6	4	17	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	15	7	10	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	3	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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

Wednesday 8/12/2020

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	71	91	103	104	85	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	556
Attendance below 90 percent	22	33	34	22	26	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	1	11	7	10	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	18	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	1	23	16	25	29	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125

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	2	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	71	91	103	104	85	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	556
Attendance below 90 percent	22	33	34	22	26	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	1	11	7	10	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	18	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	1	23	16	25	29	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125

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	2	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	41%	47%	57%	41%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	45%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	52%	53%	43%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	37%	51%	63%	42%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	44%	58%	62%	54%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	49%	51%	40%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	47%	53%	40%	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	36%	44%	-8%	58%	-22%
	2018	33%	46%	-13%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	49%	-4%	58%	-13%
	2018	42%	43%	-1%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	42%	45%	-3%	56%	-14%
	2018	50%	46%	4%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	49%	-6%	62%	-19%
	2018	35%	48%	-13%	62%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
	2018	49%	47%	2%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	33%	45%	-12%	60%	-27%
	2018	44%	50%	-6%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	44%	2%	53%	-7%
	2018	57%	49%	8%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	11	27	14	18	41	33	16				
HSP	55	55		47	40						
MUL	45			60							
WHT	40	51	40	36	45	34	50				
FRL	36	47	42	32	40	35	43				
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	9	39	46	19	19	15	29				
HSP	36	43		41	36						
MUL	60			60							
WHT	42	46	46	43	50	31	61				
FRL	39	44	47	39	46	29	56				
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	21	37	37	20	36	30	12				
HSP	30	58		43	63						
WHT	41	43	40	42	53	40	39				
FRL	35	42	44	39	52	39	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	42
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	53
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	42
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Mathematics is the data component with the lowest performance in every area: math achievement (37%), leaning gains (44%), and proficiency of the lowest 25th percentile (33%). Students lack math fluency and struggle with basic number sense/operations. The deficit in reading proficiency contributes to students' inability to comprehend multi-step word problems. Student performance in the areas of ELA and Math have become stagnant. In addition, achievement levels of the lowest 25th quartile and students with disabilities are significantly lower than the state average. Students missing instructional time as a result of being absent, tardy, early check outs, and suspensions continues to impact students' academic performance. A focus on improving attendance and utilizing restorative discipline practices will be implemented to address these issues.

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

Science proficiency dropped 11 percentage points from 59% in 2018 to 48% in 2019. Factors contributing to this decline were lack of science-based inquiry lessons, students' struggle with informative text, and understanding content specific vocabulary. The creation of a STEM lab and more authentic opportunities to explore the Nature of Science will be integrated daily to supplement instruction, as well as the use of interactive Science journals that implement the 5 Es approach.

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 mathematics achievement was only 37% in comparison to the state's achievement level of 63%. There were also significant gaps in math learning gains (EME: 44% State: 62%) and lowest quartile achievement levels
(EME: 33% State: 51%) Students lack math fluency, number sense/basic operations, and content-specific vocabulary. Therefore the focus for the upcoming school year will be giving students more "hands-on" learning opportunities, strategic math discourse, and the continued use of standards-based instruction. Teachers will also utilize formative assessment data to drive instructional best practices.

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

The most improvement was in the area of overall ELA learning gains from 46% in 2018 to 50% in 2019. An emphasis on meeting the required number of minutes and pass rate on i-Ready along with prescriptive and consistent progress monitoring of reading intervention groups contributed to an increase of ELA learning gains.

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

Attendance and discipline are two areas of concern. 30% of the students during the 2019-2020 school year had an attendance rate below 90 percent which was an increase of 27 students from the previous year. There was a slight increase in the number of out of school suspensions from 55 to 59 incidents.

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

1. Provide standards-based and differentiated instruction for ELA, Math, and Science to all students at all
proficiency levels.
2. Implement school-wide initiatives that address attendance, behavior, and social emotional learning.
3. Provide teachers with opportunities to collaborate, plan, and consistently analyze student data weekly.
4. Provide all staff members with professional development that will address traditional and virtual instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on students' assessment data on FSA Math, ELA, and Science shows an ongoing pattern of non-proficiency in those areas specifically among our students with disabilities (SWD); this reflects a weakness of standards-based instructional practices. Rationale • SWD ELA Achievement: 11% • SWD ELA Learning Gains: 27% • SWD ELA Lowest 25th Percentile: 14% • SWD MA Achievement: 18% • SWD MA Learning Gains: 41% • SWD MA Lowest 25th Percentile: 33% • SWD SCI Achievement: 16% • Low Economic ELA Achievement: 35% • Low Economic ELA Learning Gains: 47% • Low Economic ELA Lowest 25th Percentile: 42% • Low Economic MA Achievement: 32% • Low Economic MA Learning Gains: 40% • Low Economic MA Lowest 25th Percentile: 35% • Low Economic Science Achievement: 43%
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers utilize data to determine students' needs and plan differentiated lessons aligned to FL Standards in ELA, Math, and Science will increase in the following measures: Learning gains: • Total Students 3-5 for ELA: 50% to 60% and MA: 44% to 60% • SWD ELA: 27% to 35% and SWD MA: 41% to 50% • Low Economic ELA: 47% to 60% and Low Economic MA 40% to 60% Proficiency: • Total Students Proficient 3-5 for ELA: 41% to 51%; MA: 37% to 47%; and SCI: 48% to 58% • SWD ELA: 11% to 21%; SWD MA: 18% to 28% • Low Economic ELA: 36% to 45%; Low Economic MA 32% to 42% as measured by FSA and FSSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning notes, data analysis reports and charts of i-Ready and district testing data, lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	• Overall ELA Achievement: 41% • Overall ELA Learning Gains: 50% • Overall ELA Lowest 25th Percentile: 39% • Overall MA Achievement: 37% • Overall MA Learning Gains: 44% • Overall MA Lowest 25th Percentile: 33%

Action Steps to Implement

Create master schedule which will provide common grade-level planning weekly to unwrap standards and plan standards-based instruction..

Person Responsible   Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide teachers with opportunities to collaborate with grade-level peers and vertically to ensure that standards are being taught in a systematic way.

Person Responsible   Allison Laplante (allison.laplante@marion.k12.fl.us)

Conduct collaborative planning and data analysis bi-monthly Pre-K through 5th grade as a way to continuously reflect on instructional practices that are aligned to standards and student outcomes.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Mobley (kimberly.mobley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Content Area Specialists ELA will provide additional support to teachers focused on Tier 2 & 3 needs.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Mobley (kimberly.mobley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Integrate the use of program reports (iReady, Reflex, Performance Matters, etc.) to analyzed data, trends, and identify specific student groups that need assistance.

Person Responsible   Heather Nieb (heather.nieb1@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By providing teachers with professional development opportunities that are focused on improving their instructional practices then result will be an increase in effective delivery of standards-based instruction in all content areas and an improvement of students' academic performance.
Measurable Outcome:	If instructional and non-instructional staff are provided with effective professional development focused on standards based instructional "best" practices and ongoing support then student proficiency in ELA, Math and Science will increase by the following measures: • Total Students Proficient 3-5 for ELA: 41% to 51%; MA: 37% to 47%; and SCI: 48% to 58% • Low Economic ELA: 36% to 45%; Low Economic MA 32% to 42% as measured by FSA and FSSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	• Setting clear instructional expectations • Increasing student engagement by providing authentic learning opportunities that is project based. • Incorporating content specific inquiry and discourse. • Infusing distributive checks for understanding and formative assessments. • Providing opportunities for students given across content areas to read, speak, and write using evidence from both literary and informational texts
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research Strategies outlined Robert Marzano and Mike Schmoker

Action Steps to Implement

Based on staff survey develop professional development plan with leadership team to empathize Tier I instruction, content specific inquiry and discourse, and differentiated intervention strategies.

Person Responsible	Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)

Content Area Specialists in ELA and Math will provide routine professional development to teachers to ensure effective Tier I instruction during collaboration and planning.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Mobley (kimberly.mobley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor effectiveness of implementation using action planning and learning walks, as well as, observational data and feedback.

Person Responsible	Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)

Routine review of standards-based instruction, item specs, and the use of formative assessments to drive instructional planning.

Person Responsible	Allison Laplante (allison.laplante@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide teachers with opportunities to collaborate with grade-level peers and vertically to ensure that standards are being taught in a systematic way.

Person Responsible   Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Social emotional learning and restorative discipline practices that impact school-wide attendance. During the 2019-2020 school year, 39% of the students had an attendance rate below 90 percent with 12% of the students having one or more out of school-suspensions.
Measurable Outcome:	If school stakeholders receive targeted professional development on ongoing support to implement social emotional learning and restorative discipline practices then the school will decrease the number of students that have below 90% average of attendance from 217 to 150 students and decrease discipline referrals resulting in out of school suspensions from 64 to 50 students for the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Attendance reports (tardies, absences, early check-outs) Discipline referral reports MDT and CST referrals
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 2019-2020 school year, 39% of the students had an attendance rate below 90 percent. 12% of the students had one or more out of school suspensions.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development (monthly modules) for instructional/non-instructional staff focused on "Love and Logic, Sanford Harmony, and restorative discipline practices with follow-up implementation and support.

Person Responsible	Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)

Implement Sanford Harmony curriculum daily with the Morning Meet Up and integration of monthly cultural awareness focus (traditionally/virtually).

Person Responsible	Heather Nieb (heather.nieb1@marion.k12.fl.us)

School Counselors will work collaboratively to communicate with parents consistently on the importance of attendance and its impact on instruction through monthly newsletters and personalized phone calls to families.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Rivera (stephanie.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us)

Emphasize school-wide attendance expectations (students and staff) and slogan: "On time and Ready to Learn!" Provide visible recognition throughout the school setting and weekly recognition of students and staff on Morning announcements.

Person Responsible	Allison Laplante (allison.laplante@marion.k12.fl.us)

Implement school-wide ROAR expectations for behavior across the school setting with an emphasis on owning one's behavior and being ready to learn which will include an attendance focus.

Person Responsible	Kerrie D'Esposito (kerrie.desposito@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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00