Ocala Springs Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ocala Springs Elementary School

5757 NE 40TH AVENUE RD, Ocala, FL 34479

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Cino

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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

Ocala Springs Elementary School

5757 NE 40TH AVENUE RD, Ocala, FL 34479

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	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	50%

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.

Our mission is to empower our students to use higher order thinking skills, responsible decision making strategies, and problem solving skills necessary to grow academically and socially. Teachers and staff will utilize various forms of data to make instructional decisions that are best for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Ocala Springs, our vision is to enhance our instructional delivery in all areas with the purpose of developing successful citizens - every student, every day.

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
Cino, Michelle	Principal	The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision–making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need; and communicates with parents as necessary.
Manning, Donald	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 a strong infrastructure 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.
Hall, Stephanie	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.
Prestipino, Angela	School Counselor	The Guidance 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 behavior concerns; 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.
Tarantino, Matthew	Dean	The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/13/2020, Michelle Cino

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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	74	92	89	111	100	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	570
Attendance below 90 percent	4	16	18	21	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	6	4	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	5	10	20	15	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	7	8	10	7	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	46	29	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	11	16	21	7	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/20/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	27	9	26	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	17	11	12	32	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	17	31	17	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	30	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	21	28	34	46	41	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	27	9	26	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	17	11	12	32	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	17	31	17	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	30	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	21	28	34	46	41	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	53%	47%	57%	50%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	58%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	53%	48%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	51%	63%	46%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	58%	62%	48%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	49%	51%	26%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	47%	53%	45%	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	48%	44%	4%	58%	-10%
	2018	48%	46%	2%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	49%	1%	58%	-8%
	2018	47%	43%	4%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	46%	45%	1%	56%	-10%
	2018	52%	46%	6%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	49%	-6%	62%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	48%	-3%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	54%	-2%	64%	-12%
	2018	57%	47%	10%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison	7%					
05	2019	45%	45%	0%	60%	-15%
	2018	47%	50%	-3%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison	-12%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	44%	-2%	53%	-11%
	2018	54%	49%	5%	55%	-1%
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	16	41	35	20	36	35	19				
ELL	46	40		38	50						
BLK	34	50	43	36	44	21	28				
HSP	50	47		43	53		29				
MUL	60	58		67	50						
WHT	59	59	43	56	55	26	50				
FRL	48	54	46	47	50	31	38				
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	18	34	35	16	19	16	39				
ELL	14			14							
BLK	28	43	39	42	41	13	36				
HSP	42	37	27	49	57		50				
MUL	47	36		71	82						
WHT	62	52	28	57	60	35	72				
FRL	44	43	32	47	51	29	48				

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	23	54	39	13	25	15					
ELL	9			9							
BLK	31	43	50	25	24	8	31				
HSP	39	52		44	57		50				
MUL	82			73							
WHT	55	61	40	51	54	29	46				
FRL	42	50	43	37	43	26	36				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	46
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	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	37
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	59
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	50
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	45
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.

Bottom Quartile in math only made 31% gains, up 2% from last year. Low math growth in the bottom quartile is a trend. 2016 - 31%; 2017 - 26%; 2018 - 29%. After walking through classrooms during instruction, teachers are not teaching to the rigor of the standard, and independent practice is low rigor. Teachers have not had the opportunity to meet with administration to discuss math data specifically on a weekly basis. There were substitutes in 2 classrooms until November, when certified were hired.

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

Science Achievement dropped from 59% to 44%. Student behavior played a factor in time on task. Teachers did not spend time specifically planning for science instruction, based on standards.

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.

3rd grade math data had the biggest gap with 19 points below the state average. In our sub groups, math learning gains in the bottom quartile for black students was 13% and students with disabilities, 16%. After walking through classrooms, some teachers did not teacher to the rigor of the standard. Very few teachers did guided math instruction using data to differentiate for students. Support facilitators rarely worked with their students in small groups.

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

The bottom quartile in ELA showed the greatest gains. Teachers implemented Top Score writing in February. Mentors were created for our bottom % students. Teachers focused on these students during iReady professional development and planning.

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

Course failures is a concern. The number of course failures is significantly lower than the students earning a level 1 on the FSA. This indicates that parents and families are not aware of their students' progress on grade level standards work.
Another area of concern is number of out of school suspensions.

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

1. Math Learning Gains in the bottom quartile
2. ELA Learning Gains in the bottom quartile
3. BLK Learning Gains (Federal Index Indicator)
4. SWD Learning Gains (Federal Index Indicator)
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Delivery of Data Based Interventions & Remediation to ensure growth for all students.

If we focus on interventions being delivered with fidelity and small group remediation during the ELA and math blocks, growth in our 4th and 5th grade students based on the 2020 FSA will improve.

Measurable Outcome:

If our students in our lowest quartile and Federal Index subgroups get remediation and interventions done with fidelity, learning gains will improve from 31% in math to 51% in grades 4 and 5 as measured by FSA. Our learning gains in the bottom quartile will improve from 48% to 60% in ELA as measured by FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Cino (michelle.cino@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Students will receive research based interventions during the MTSS block for reading and small group instruction and remediation during the math block.
4th & 5th grade students will be placed into reading interventions or acceleration groups during the MTSS block based on 2018-2019 FSA ELA scores and AP1 iReady data. Students will also receive the intervention placement test before going into a specific program to ensure effectiveness.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Students will receive math remediation and interventions based on 2019 FSA Math scores and AP1 iReady data. Teachers will determine what area of math individuals are struggling in, and provide small group instruction and intervention.
Teachers and leadership team will review QSMA and iReady data from both benchmark and progress monitoring assessments to determine the effectiveness of the interventions and remediation. Interventions will be fluid throughout the year based on determinations during PMP meetings.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet with teachers after iReady AP1 to look at data and determine needs for individual students in reading and math.
2. CAS and leadership will give students placement tests for the MTSS block.
3. Teachers will receive training and modeling in their specific interventions from both district and school based personnel.
4. Teachers will participate in weekly planning meetings and a monthly meeting with administration to look at intervention and classroom data to determine effectiveness of the interventions and if placement is appropriate.

Person Responsible

Michelle Cino (michelle.cino@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students will participate in morning meeting and lessons delivered by the teachers in the district adopted program, Sanford Harmony. Social emotional learning helps children understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions both socially and academically.
Measurable Outcome:	If OSE utilizes the Sanford Harmony program to teach students how to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions both socially and academically then discipline referrals will decrease from 18% to 13%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Ulrich (angela.ulrich@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	According to De Lay (2016), As part of a longitudinal social network analysis (SNA), 631 fifth grade students were recruited to examine how a social emotional learning intervention might be associated with peer socialization on academic performance. Fourteen classroom received a relationship building intervention and eighth classrooms served as control groups. A pre and post test was administered and students had to nominate their friends. Teachers completed assessments of students' writing and math performance. Results showed that for those fourteen classrooms which received the relationship building intervention, social segregation was less evident as a function of ethnicity and academic ability as well as improved writing and math performance. Findings provided initial evidence that SEL interventions may change social processes in a classroom peer network and may break down barriers of social segregation and improve academic performance. DeLay D, Zhang L, Hanish LD, et al. Peer Influence on Academic Performance: A Social Network Analysis of Social-Emotional Intervention Effects. Prev Sci. 2016;17(8):903-913. doi:10.1007/s11121-016-0678-8
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on last year's BESS screener from the 19-20 school year, a large percentage of the students on our campus need for additional support in Social Emotional Learning. Taking current circumstances into consideration, OSE expects even a higher percentage of students needing support in this area.

Action Steps to Implement

1. During the first week of school, teachers will complete a BESS screener and students will complete a survey relating to the 5 core components of SEL, which are self-awareness, self-management, responsible decision-making, relationship skills, and social awareness.
2. Teachers will participate in a daily morning meeting for the first 10 minutes of the school day, and then Sanford Harmony lessons twice a week for 30 minutes.
3. Students will participate in morning meeting and lessons delivered by the teachers in the district adopted program, Sanford Harmony. Social emotional learning helps children understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions both socially and academically.
4. Provide support for teachers and assistance with the implementation of these programs.

Person Responsible Angela Ulrich (angela.ulrich@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student Proficiency If we delivery rigorous standards based instruction and weekly data & planning meetings, student proficiency will improve based on the FSA and NGSSS Science Assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	If we deliver rigorous instruction during the ELA and math blocks, student proficiency will improve from 53% to 58% in ELA and 51% to 56% in Math based on the 2021 FSA. Proficiency on the NGSSS Science Assessment will improve from 44% to 54%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Cino (michelle.cino@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will participate in weekly planning meetings with the assistant principal to plan rigorous standards based instruction. Teachers will also meet with administration on a monthly basis to disaggregate current data and discuss research based strategies being used in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student proficiency only went up 2 points on the ELA FSA and went down 2 points on the FSA math assessment. Science proficiency went down 15 points on the 5th grade NGSSS Science Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. 4th and 5th grade students received data on the 2019 FSA, broken
down by strand.
2. Teachers are receiving professional development on Top Score Writing
and iReady.
3. Teachers will plan rigorous instruction with the assistant principal and
reading coach weekly.
4. Teachers will meet with administration monthly to look at ELA, Math and
Science data to determine proficient students maintain proficiency and
"bubble" students identified by iReady are closing the gap to proficiency

Person Responsible	Donald Manning (donald.manning@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.

Based on the Federal Index, our SWD (students with disabilities) and BLK (Black) students are not meeting the requirement of 41%. With both areas of focus mentioned above, leadership will monitor effectiveness of areas of focus for these subgroups using several source of data. Attendance and behavior will also be monitored to ensure these aren't barriers for the students' growth. Support Facilitators will work closely with teachers, leadership, and the ESE specialist to monitor growth and discuss where additional support is needed.

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: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**