Reddick Collier Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Reddick Collier Elementary School

4595 W HIGHWAY 316, Reddick, FL 32686

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Donald Manning

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2020

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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (43%) 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

Reddick Collier Elementary School

4595 W HIGHWAY 316, Reddick, FL 32686

[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	71%

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.

Reddick-Collier celebrates the people we are, the work we do and the difference we make.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reddick-Collier is building a strong foundation to graduation and beyond.

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
Sandy, Christine	Principal	Day to day management of school site School- home Liaison Facilitator Pre K - 5th grade Instructional Leader Student Service Support Team Member Professional Development Facilitator School Safety Coordinator Human Resource Operations Student Achievement Monitor
Roberts, Tina	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for math 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.
Allen, Clayton	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.
Krietemeyer, Carol	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.
Goodson, Jennifer	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor assist school administrators and educators with planning and carrying out school-related programs and events. Her main duties include: helping students maintain academic focus, assisting students at risk, identifying individual skills, and tackling emotional problems. In addition she interprets and conducts analysis of data; facilitates the development of intervention plans;and provides support for intervention fidelity. She assists with professional development for behavior concerns and assists in facilitating 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.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Molock, Dwayne	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) implements disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. Working closely with families and the teaching staff, the Dean assists in facilitating positive interaction with the learning environment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/23/2020, Donald Manning

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

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 (48%)

	2017-18: F (28%)
	2016-17: C (43%)
	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	73	64	53	72	64	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	9	39	29	23	32	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	1	4	8	6	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	3	3	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	2	1	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	28	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	6	8	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Sunday 5/31/2020

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	66	53	48	58	67	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	359
Attendance below 90 percent	13	17	7	7	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	9	7	16	6	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	7	14	3	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	35	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	10	15	23	13	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	66	53	48	58	67	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	359
Attendance below 90 percent	13	17	7	7	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	9	7	16	6	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	7	14	3	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	35	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	10	15	23	13	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	40%	47%	57%	39%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	51%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	53%	52%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	46%	51%	63%	41%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	58%	62%	45%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	49%	51%	35%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	47%	53%	39%	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	45%	44%	1%	58%	-13%
	2018	33%	46%	-13%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	30%	49%	-19%	58%	-28%
	2018	34%	43%	-9%	56%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	46%	45%	1%	56%	-10%
	2018	28%	46%	-18%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	49%	15%	62%	2%
	2018	28%	48%	-20%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		36%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	54%	-12%	64%	-22%
	2018	31%	47%	-16%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	34%	45%	-11%	60%	-26%
	2018	38%	50%	-12%	61%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	44%	-7%	53%	-16%
	2018	29%	49%	-20%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	9	38	38	10	62	62					
ELL	42	73		48	71						
BLK	31	56	42	41	58	57	17				
HSP	39	59		50	59		36				
WHT	52	56		49	53		55				
FRL	35	54	46	44	56	63	31				
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	3	8	6	6	19	13	14				
ELL	16	8		11	23						

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
BLK	22	22	18	21	35	19	11				
HSP	29	19		26	31		33				
WHT	51	34		50	46		57				
FRL	28	25	17	29	36	18	27				
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	14	25	30	17	35						
ELL	21			21							
BLK	28	51	50	24	37		22				
HSP	31	38		35	46						
WHT	58	60		62	50		73				
FRL	36	51	55	36	42	35	33				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	416
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	62
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	53
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	51
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.

*4th grade ELA
*5th grade Math
The ELA data indicates a decline in 4th grade ELA proficiency in both cohort comparison by 3% and in same grade result by 4%. A contributing factor in this decline was the stability of the faculty and the design of the instructional delivery. The faculty at that grade level grade level finally stabilized in February and also by then, the instructional delivery had departmentalized with consistent push in support. The The math data indicates a 4% decline in 5th grade proficiency from 17-18 to 18 -19. However, the same cohort of students from 4th to 5th highlighted a 3% increase in proficiency. Students at this grade level were functioning a year behind expectation and lacked expertise numbers and operations. Consequently, as 5th grade standards were being taught, students struggled in their mastery of the content and did not met expected growth.

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

*5th grade Math
The 4% math decline in 5th grade is linked to the mastery of previous math standards at other grade levels. There was such a gap in overall math mastery across grade levels, student achievement is culminating in 5th grade where for the last two years, the level of proficiency remains below 40%. Contributing to this gap has been teacher efficacy in understanding effective math strategies, student mastery of basic math operations and classroom instruction to the depth and breathe of the math standards. Math has traditionally been an area of needed improvement across all grade levels and this data is highlighted the continued need for improvement.

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.

The reading and math proficiencies each averaged about 17% behind state averages, while science was 16% behind the state. In totality the data indicates a closing of the achievement gap from the previous year however, there is still a deficiency. In the previous year the gap between the school and the state demonstrated 20 - 30% differences, whereas this year, the gap has reduced to 10 - 20 % differences. 4th grade ELA, 5th grade math and 5th grade science were contributing factors in this overall continued gap. Within each of these grade levels, student proficiencies did not meet expectations and consequently, the learning gains and bottom quartile did not demonstrate growth.

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

Overall, student proficiency 3rd grade for ELA and math demonstrated the greatest improvement from the previous year. Third grade math exceeded state averages. Our

school had a new focus on standards-based instruction. Experienced teachers in this grade level was also a factor.

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

Two potential areas of concern are 42 students with attendance below 90% and 87 students with a Level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Standards-based instruction
2. Student ownership of learning
3. Strong formative assessments to inform instruction
4. Build teacher knowledge of high-impact instruction and higher-order questioning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instruction: Instructional Activities/Strategies For the past two years the Students with Disabilities subgroup has fell below the Federal Index. To close the achievement gap the following strategies will be implemented: - Continue to build a solid ELA MTSS block at each grade with laser focus on implementation and a common implementation time within the school day. . -Implement a math MTSS block at each grade level as a part of the math block. -Implement a Sanford Harmony block of instruction during social studies time with fidelity for social and emotional growth and development.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers incorporate an ELA and math MTSS block with fidelity within their academic day, then targeted students identified with a Federal Index below 40% will show an increase in proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math as measured by the 2020 -2021 FSA. If teachers incorporate Sanford Harmony with fidelity, the number of students with disabilities identified with a Federal Index below 40% will show an increase in growth in the areas of ELA and Math as measured by the 2020 -2021 FSA. Participation in Sanford Harmony will improve their social emotional learning and will in turn impact their attendance, which is linked to their overall achievement. Students with Disabilities subgroup currently at 31% proficiency will increase to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Clayton Allen (clayton.allen@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explore high impact intervention strategies to deliver within the brick and mortar classroom and in a digital format for MCPS On Line . After making the selection, purchase the best possible options. Faculty and staff will participate in weekly professional development opportunities to gain knowledge, skill and expertise in specific evidence based MTSS intervention strategies. Professional development will focus on designing and implementing an effective intervention block in both the classroom and in the digital format; using the available data to determine the needs of students and how best to meet those needs with which type of intervention; and training those assigned specific interventions on the best deliver methods. Weekly collaborative planning will include a focus on student data and the impact specific interventions are having on student success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rationale for this strategy is indicated by formal and informal data points, student performance and classroom observations. Evidence of the effectiveness will include: classroom walkthroughs; classroom observations; district testing data such as i-Ready and QSMAs and school level data chats. .

Action Steps to Implement

1. Math Intervention Block:
-Finalize the purchase of math intervention material.
-Design delivery models targeting brick and mortar/digital
-Train faculty and staff
-Progress monitor
-Utilize iReady AP2 data to adjust implementation plan

Person Responsible Tina Roberts (tina.roberts@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. ELA Intervention Block
-Determine common intervention time.
-Align interventions to student needs
-Determine best practices for brick and mortar/ digital delivery of ELA interventions.
-Train as needed.
-Progress monitor
-Utilize iReady AP2 data to adjust implementation plan

Person Responsible Carol Krietemeyer (carol.krietemeyer@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Social/Emotional
-Train faculty and staff on Sanford Harmony
-Determine digital delivery
-Leadership team monitor data and intervene as needed.

Person Responsible Jennifer Goodson (jennifer.goodson@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instruction: Teaching Informed by Multiple Types of Assessments If we focus on developing a professional learning community of educators that recognize the importance of working together to foster classroom practices that strengthen the learning of each student, student achievement will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers use formative assessments to plan and deliver Florida Standards aligned instruction in Reading and Math, then students in grades 3-5 will show an increase in proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA. -3rd grade will increase ELA proficiency from 35% to 40%, math proficiency will maintain 64% -4th grade will increase ELA proficiency from 30% to 40%, math proficiency will increase from 42% to 45% -5th grade will increase ELA proficiency from 46% to 50%, math proficiency will increase from 34% to 40%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Sandy (christine.sandy@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evaluate the effectiveness of formative assessments in the context of daily classroom instruction. Redirecting core instruction to address student's remedial needs. Improve the higher order questioning techniques to match formative assessments. Mentor new, novice and developing teachers by implementing a "buddy system." Mentor, train and develop digital learning teachers in effective implementation of Goggle Classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Last year we could not be responsive to student's remedial needs with the data points utilized. Effective formative assessments will be utilized as a tool to impact daily instruction, student mastery of standards, and improve teacher efficacy of understanding what the formative assessment data is year long saying about student mastery.

Action Steps to Implement	

The Leadership Team will design, publish and monitor a year long professional development calendar of opportunities for faculty and staff.

Person Responsible	Christine Sandy (christine.sandy@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instruction: Instructional Activities/Strategies If we empower student ownership of behavior and learning with high expectations and providing the necessary tools, resources and strategies needed for success student achievement will improve Observations from last year indicated that student engagement was an area of focus and empowering them with the necessary equipment for success, they will improve their overall achievement. This will be be more complicated this year as students are not only in brick and mortar, but also functioning in a digital environment. Targeted steps include: -A specific and consistent guide for student behavior expectations. -Develop student/classroom expectations. -Develop a new student orientation for each incoming student on our way of work. -Conduct a book study with each new teacher on Assertive Discipline. -Contract with outside agencies to provide school counseling and mentoring services. -Continue data chats/student led Open Houses and student led conferencing.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers foster effective student ownership strategies for learning, then all students will show an increase in proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math as measured by the 2020 -2021 FSA. -3rd grade will increase ELA proficiency from 35% to 40%, math proficiency will maintain 64% -4th grade will increase ELA proficiency from 30% to 40%, math proficiency will increase from 42% to 45% -5th grade will increase ELA proficiency from 46% to 50%, math proficiency will increase from 34% to 40%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Sandy (christine.sandy@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data notebooks, rubrics, surveys and self-reflections will be utilized as evidence for this strategy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student ownership focuses on student driven decision making and student empowerment. These internalizing factors can be difficult to measure, consequently the outcome measures and outputs will reflect more on the effectiveness of the strategies, not true student ownership. Whether at school or at home, students will create and manage data notebooks tracking data points on formative assessments. Students will also participate in activities with rubrics and have opportunities for self-reflection. The faculty and staff will complete sign in sheets and surveys of tracking.

Action Steps to Implement

As a job responsibility, the Guidance Counselor and Dean have assigned themselves to develop, train and progress monitor the discipline strategies, orientation and counseling strategies. The Leadership Team is overseeing the data chats and school wide activities. They will also design and deliver a parallel digital component that is meeting the same expectations as what a student will encounter in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Christine Sandy (christine.sandy@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.

It is apparent how student attendance supersedes all improvement activities. The Leadership Team needs to intensive their efforts to keep students actively engaged in their learning. The Leadership Team needs to develop a digital access to learning for all students whether they are in brick and mortar or not. Students need to continue their learning every day and we must figure out a way to achieve this goal in a school year whether you are here or not.

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 how 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, Peach Jar, school website, teacher webpage, Goggle Classroom, 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. Parents and the community are kept current of the school focus through Facebook and Peach Jar ANNOUNCEMENTS.

This upcoming year will be a first year of a business partnership with a community business. It is our goal to

complement and reinforce the value of the educational experience, build a culture collaboration and provide learning opportunities that we can not provide the students.

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: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00