

Marion County Public Schools

Fessenden 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Fessenden Elementary School

4200 NW 89TH PL, Ocala, FL 34482

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Stacie Newmones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2018

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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: F (25%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: F (30%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Fessenden Elementary School

4200 NW 89TH PL, Ocala, FL 34482

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

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

Fessenden will build and foster positive working relationships, a learning environment that is student centered and includes a community of citizens that are excited, committed and motivated in the belief that all of our students are capable learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fessenden staff will continually develop as professionals in order to adapt to the academic, emotional and social needs of ourselves and our students.

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
Redd, Lacy	Principal	Provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The employee in this position supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school and reports to the assigned administrator.
Coy, Lisa	Assistant Principal	To aid the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Slagle, Mary	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the area of literacy utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning
Stokes, Moneshia	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the area of math utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning
Jackson, Jasmine	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. Reports to Principal and/or Assistant Principal and supervises assigned support staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/6/2018, Stacie Newmones

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: F (25%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: F (30%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	77	66	60	83	56	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	37	34	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/30/2020

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	42	70	53	95	46	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	359
Attendance below 90 percent	33	29	40	41	27	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	2	1	7	11	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	5	15	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	12	6	20	20	24	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

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	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	42	70	53	95	46	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	359
Attendance below 90 percent	33	29	40	41	27	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	2	1	7	11	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	5	15	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	12	6	20	20	24	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

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	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	30%	47%	57%	45%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	61%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	53%	56%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	31%	51%	63%	41%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	43%	58%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	49%	51%	50%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	47%	53%	31%	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	24%	44%	-20%	58%	-34%
	2018	26%	46%	-20%	57%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	49%	-9%	58%	-18%
	2018	26%	43%	-17%	56%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	31%	45%	-14%	56%	-25%
	2018	22%	46%	-24%	55%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	49%	-12%	62%	-25%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	15%	54%	-39%	64%	-49%
	2018	28%	47%	-19%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2019	36%	45%	-9%	60%	-24%
	2018	21%	50%	-29%	61%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	44%	-13%	53%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	19%	49%	-30%	55%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
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	17	35		14	31						
ELL	35	44		38	35		18				
BLK	19	50	50	21	41	47	19				
HSP	29	52		35	41		24				
WHT	44	50		42	49		53				
FRL	23	49	56	29	47	58	24				
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	29	45	18	19	20					
ELL	21	24		25	6						
BLK	17	25	29	28	23	22	9				
HSP	34	28		38	14		25				
WHT	34	31		40	23		38				
FRL	23	27	29	31	20	23	16				
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	57		13	29						
ELL	28	61		25	46	64	23				
BLK	39	48	57	32	49	50	7				
HSP	43	65	46	40	51	60	52				
WHT	51	68		50	60		29				
FRL	40	59	55	36	50	58	27				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
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.

Our lowest performing area was Science at 29% proficiency. We believe our low reading proficiency is making it difficult for the 5th grade students to read and understand the science questions on fsa, as well as we struggle across the board in the area of vocabulary, which impacts science .

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

The only area we declined in was in Mathematics proficiency from 34% to 31%, predominantly our 4th grade math performance at 15% was substantially low. Our 4th grade team was completely made up of substitutes for the first nine weeks and struggled recovering from that. This year we have no teaching vacancies.

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.

Mathematics achievement has the biggest gap from school to state with a 32% gap , School at 31% and state at 63%. Teacher shortage caused substitutes for many classrooms,, students with academic gaps from previous grade levels, in particular low performance in 4th grade caused average to be low with the other grades with increase percentages. Again no vacancies this year.

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

Lower quartile gains in ELA and Mathematics both showed huge improvements. ELA from 28% to 55% and Math from 21% to 57%. Our identification early of the lower quartile and specific targeted instruction to these students through small group increased these scores.

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

Attendance is a concern at Fessenden. 145 students flagged for at least one quarter with below 90% attendance. This will continue to be a priority area and we will use the attendance officer and our parent liaison to make close contact with these families.

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

1. Higher and retain a stable staff
2. A common and deeper understanding of the ELA, Math and Science standards
3. A common expectation of high quality student work as defined by common unit formative assessments.
4. A common instructional approach for each content area.
5. A system of using ongoing formative student achievement data that would encourage collaborative reflection about improving instruction and increasing student achievement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	Academic Achievement
Description and Rationale:	A continued pattern of low proficiency in Reading and Math and low performance on standards checks, demonstrates a weakness in standards-based instructional practice.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>If teachers implement effective standards based instruction in ELA, Math and science and implement additional instructional support for Tier 2 for reading, then student proficiency will increase by the following measures:</p> <p>Subject Grades Assessment Proficiency Goal Learning Gains Goal Lower Quartile Learning Gains Goals ELA K iReady 90%+ < 5% in Red 1 iReady 75% < 5% in Red 2 iReady 60% < 5% in Red 3-5 FSA 40% 60% 65% Math K iReady < 5% in Red 1 iReady < 5% in Red 2 iReady < 5% in Red 3-5 FSA 40% 60% 65% Science 5 FSA 50%</p> <p>Identification and tier 2 support for lower quartile students, as well as identified ESSA groups of black and students with disabilities, will result in improved achievement.</p> <p>A quality online program for both tier 1, tier 2 and tier 3 is planned and ready to implement.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning using Florida standards to support standards based instruction. As well as clearly defined intervention programs, done to fidelity, with training and support for teachers to address tier 2 and tier 3 needs of students for face to face and online students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Teachers struggle with knowing their standards as evidence by observations during collaborative planning, and their instruction . Collaborative planning will be supported by administration and coaches.</p> <p>Intervention programs must be done to fidelity and programs match students needs for both face to face and online students.</p>
Action Steps to Implement	
Collaborative planning scheduled and expectations made clear to staff. Online teachers to participate as well.	
Person Responsible	Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)
Collaborative planning held weekly by coaches and supported by administrative team for all teachers.	
Person Responsible	Mary Slagle (mary.slagle@marion.k12.fl.us)

Training on standards, best practices, and testing limits done by admin and outside consultant. Online quality instruction also discussed and best practices implemented.

Person Responsible Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)

Data analyzed to group students by intervention, groups created, intervention programs PD, and observations done on all staff teaching programs with feedback for fidelity

Person Responsible Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus	Behavior and Engagement
Description and Rationale:	We reduced the number of out of school suspensions from 56 to 21. We want to maintain that number and keep reducing. Largest number of offenses happen in classrooms with 103. Next largest is hallways.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>If all stakeholders establish and enforce school-wide expectations and behaviors, then students will be engaged during instructional time which will result in a ten percent decrease in students with one or more suspension. this in turn will increased academic achievement as measured by end of year assessments.</p> <p>Subject Grades Assessment Proficiency Goal Learning Gains Goal Lower Quartile Learning Gains Goals</p> <p>ELA K iReady 90%+ < 5% in Red 1 iReady 75% < 5% in Red 2 iReady 60% < 5% in Red 3-5 FSA 40% 60% 65% Math K iReady < 5% in Red 1 iReady < 5% in Red 2 iReady < 5% in Red 3-5 FSA 40% 60% 65% Science 5 FSA 50%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Coy (lisa.coy@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>If FDE incorporates PBS and Stanford Harmony into it's daily expectations and behaviors we will see a decrease in disruptive behaviors. Online expectations included.</p> <p>Today's schoolchildren confront an increasingly fraught testing environment, a lower tolerance for physical acting out, and the pervasive threat of violence. We will fully Implement PBS and purchase of any supplies needed. We will also Implement Sanford Harmony into our School wide expectations set and shared with all. Teachers and staff trained in de-escalation techniques and planning and carrying out engaging lessons.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	
Action Steps to Implement	
First week of school, teachers will review a list of expectations school wide. These will be repeated as needed for compliance and again when return in January. We also have online learning expectations schoolwide.	
Person Responsible	Jasmine Jackson (jasmine.jackson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Sanford Harmony training done by all teachers. Lesson plans and classrooms monitored for implementation y by admin team.	
Person Responsible	Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Parent Engagement Rationale: Parent engagement activities are often poorly attended with only about 10% of parents attending events. We need to double this outcome in 2020-21
Measurable Outcome:	If FNE can build capacity with parents to attend flexible events in order to learn strategic strategies to help their children understand state standards, then behavior and academic proficiency will increase as measured by IReady data. Subject Grades Assessment Proficiency Goal Learning Gains Goal Lower Quartile Learning Gains Goals ELA K iReady 90%+ < 5% in Red 1 iReady 75% < 5% in Red 2 iReady 60% < 5% in Red 3-5 FSA 40% 60% 65% Math K iReady < 5% in Red 1 iReady < 5% in Red 2 iReady < 5% in Red 3-5 FSA 40% 60% 65% Science 5 FSA 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us) Parental Engagement is an area of need at Fessenden. With parents working or lack of transportation, it is often hard to get parents engaged in their
Evidence-based Strategy:	child's education. If we can get parents involved, as a partner, in the educational needs then the students will benefit both academically and with their behavior, and achievement will rise. We will Through the Parent Engagement Plan, host parent nights, provide
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	training in order for parents to help their students, and plan events for parent involvement into the school. Planners/folders will be used to improve communication between school and home.
Action Steps to Implement	
Person Responsible	Parent Engagement Plan shared with parents at the Annual Title 1 meeting Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)

Parent events carried out, well advertised, feedback received from parents . Online support links also posted on school website and you tube channel for parents of students studying online.

Person Responsible

Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@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.

We will use TSSSA monies to support improved achievement with additional paras, full implementation of UFLI intervention program in K-2, and one additional intervention teacher that will help with monitoring of programs both online and face to face.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00