Marion County Public Schools

Sparr Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

> * 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.](http://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

Sparr Elementary School

2525 E HWY 329, Anthony, FL 32617

[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	48%

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 foster relationships with all stakeholders to remove barriers to student success. .

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a nurturing learning community, committed to preparing young minds to be academically and socially competitive for college and career readiness.

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
Street, Gay	Principal	Each member is responsible for actively participating to problem solving discussions in order to serve our students and assist with the academic/ social/emotional success of our students. Jackson - Attendance, social/emotional skills, character building Keene - student data, mentoring, instructional strategies McAdams - student data, MTSS, mentoring, instructional strategies Cooper -curriculum, student data, MTSS, grading Hinson - discipline data, mentoring, behavioral interventions Hartley - representing instructional staff, mentoring, supporting CKLA, Community Reads Jennifer - home/school connection, social groups, attendance, early warning signs
Jackson, Sandra	School Counselor	Each member is responsible for actively participating to problem solving discussions in order to serve our students and assist with the academic/ social/emotional success of our students. Jackson - Attendance, social/emotional skills, character building
Keene, Rachel	Instructional Coach	Each member is responsible for actively participating to problem solving discussions in order to serve our students and assist with the academic/ social/emotional success of our students. Keene - student data, mentoring, instructional strategies
Hartley, David	Instructional Media	Each member is responsible for actively participating to problem solving discussions in order to serve our students and assist with the academic/ social/emotional success of our students. Hartley - representing instructional staff, mentoring, supporting CKLA, Community Reads
McAdams, Kristen	Instructional Coach	Each member is responsible for actively participating to problem solving discussions in order to serve our students and assist with the academic/ social/emotional success of our students. McAdams - student data, MTSS, mentoring, instructional strategies
Cooper, Melicia	Assistant Principal	Each member is responsible for actively participating to problem solving discussions in order to serve our students and assist with the academic/ social/emotional success of our students. Cooper - curriculum, student data, MTSS, grading

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Renee Johnson

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (37%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	37	46	53	60	63	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307
Attendance below 90 percent	13	22	28	24	29	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	4	13	12	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	8	9	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/29/2020

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	47	59	64	66	65	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	378
Attendance below 90 percent	14	10	9	17	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	8	19	14	18	19	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	14	18	23	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	26	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	15	28	25	27	27	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161

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	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	47	59	64	66	65	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	378
Attendance below 90 percent	14	10	9	17	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	8	19	14	18	19	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	14	18	23	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	26	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	15	28	25	27	27	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161

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	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	36%	47%	57%	43%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	58%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	52%	53%	57%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	51%	63%	43%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	58%	62%	50%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	49%	51%	42%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	47%	53%	46%	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	26%	44%	-18%	58%	-32%
	2018	56%	46%	10%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-30%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	49%	-5%	58%	-14%
	2018	37%	43%	-6%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	33%	45%	-12%	56%	-23%
	2018	49%	46%	3%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	31%	49%	-18%	62%	-31%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	48%	-8%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	54%	-21%	64%	-31%
	2018	43%	47%	-4%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison	-10%					
Cohort Comparison	-7%					
05	2019	45%	45%	0%	60%	-15%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison	-8%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	44%	-3%	53%	-12%
	2018	60%	49%	11%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison	-19%					
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	8	56	67	12	58	58	30				
ELL	40			60							
BLK	27	53	67	27	76	75	30				
HSP	33	50		62	77						
MUL				30							
WHT	41	51	58	47	54	42	50				
FRL	34	57	68	40	66	60	52				
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	13	27		9	33						
ELL	50			50							
BLK	24	16		24	8						
HSP	58	46		63	62						
WHT	56	48	54	48	48	40	57				
FRL	43	38	39	41	35	35	51				

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	27	33		35	33						
BLK	34	73	73	44	57		40				
HSP	44	58		39	77						
MUL	60			50							
WHT	45	51	36	42	41	31	46				
FRL	41	61	59	40	47	38	41				

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	53
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
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	51
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	56
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	30
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	49
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	54
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was in ELA overall proficiency at 36%. During the 2018-19 school year, the majority of students entering 3rd grade were non-proficient in reading based on iReady end of year data, we implemented a new reading series, and in 5th grade ELA we had four instructional changes during the school year. This is not a trend based on previous school data (ELA 16-17 43% and 17-18 47%).

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

The lowest data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was our 3rd grade ELA proficiency with 24% which is a decrease of 32 percentage points from the 2017-2018 school year. The major factor contributing to this decline was a significant number of students in 3rd grade entered as non-proficient readers. Only 21% of our 2nd grade students were proficient in reading according to the iReady 2017-2018 end of year data.

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 ELA data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Sparr Elementary' s ELA proficiency for the 2018-19 school year was 36%, the district was 47% and the state was 57%, resulting in a 21% deficit between school and state and a 11% difference between the school and the district. During the 2018-19 school year, the majority of students entering 3rd grade were non-proficient in reading based on iReady end of year data, we implemented a new reading series, and in 5th grade ELA we had four instructional changes during the school year. This is not a trend based on previous school data (ELA 16-17 43% and 17-18 47%).

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

The data component that showed the most improvement overall was learning gains in both ELA and Math. Specifically our learning gains with our bottom quartile students indicated ELA increase of 31% points with 13% points in learning gains resulting in an overall learning gain increase of 44% points.
Also, our learning gains with our bottom quartile students indicated MATH increase of 24% points with 24% points in learning gains resulting in an overall learning gain increase of 48% points.
Our school improvement goal last year was meeting students where they were and improving student growth. We implemented data chats with students and student became accountable for tracking their own progress.

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

Our largest area of concern based on EWS data is the percent of students receiving a level 1 on the FSA. Thirty-eight percent of students in 3rd and 4th grade earned a level 1 in ELA and/or Math.

Another area of concern is 25% of the overall student population had 1 or more days of out of school suspension resulting in loss of instructional time.

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

1. Increasing ELA proficiency (64% of students in 3rd and 4th grade were non proficient based on level 1 and level 2 FSA results)
2. Increasing Math proficiency (67% of students in 3rd and 4th grade were non proficient based on level 1 and level 2 FSA results)
3. Continue increasing learning gains for both math and ELA including bottom quartile
4. Decreasing OSS rates
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional Activities/Strategies: Standard Based Instruction Sparr Elementary' s ELA proficiency for the 2018-19 school year was 36%, the district was 47% and the state was 57%, resulting in a 21% deficit between school and state and a 11% difference between the school and the district. We dropped 11% points from the 17-18 school year in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	If Sparr Elementary teachers consistently deliver Florida Standards and aligned instruction in ELA, then students will increase proficiency from 36% to 40% as measured by FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development - Mrs. McAdams will provide professional development to teachers to ensure effective TIER I instruction and dig deep into the depth of the standards meeting students on their instructional level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to meet the needs of all learners and increase proficiency, teachers must continually improve their instructional practice. Professional development provide the opportunity for teachers to learn and show student growth based on new learning.

Action Steps to Implement	
Weekly PLC	
Person Responsible	Kristen McAdams (kristenmcadams@marion.k12.fl.us)
On going professional development	
Person Responsible	Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)
Action study and learning walks	
Person Responsible	Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)
Professional Development	
Person Responsible	Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)
Differentiated lessons to meet the needs of students	
Person Responsible	Kristen McAdams (kristenmcadams@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional Activities/Strategies: Increasing Learning Gains Rationale Sparr Elementary' s ELA proficiency for the 2018-19 school year was 36%, the district was 47% and the state was 57%, resulting in a 21% deficit between school and state and a 11% difference between the school and the district. We dropped 11% points from the 17-18 school year in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	If Sparr Elementary teachers consistently deliver Florida Standards and aligned instruction in ELA and Math , then learning gains will rise from 54% to 57% in ELA and 64% to 67% in Math. The bottom quartile learning gains from 66% to 70% as measured by FSA ELA and 59% to 62% in math as measured by FSA Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development - Mrs. McAdams will provide professional development to teachers to ensure effective TIER I instruction and dig deep into the depth of the standards meeting students on their instructional level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to meet the needs of all learners and increase proficiency, teachers must continually improve their instructional practice. Professional development provide the opportunity for teachers to learn and show student growth based on new learning.

Action Steps to Implement	
Weekly PLC	
Person Responsible	Kristen McAdams (kristenmcadams@marion.k12.fl.us)
Collaboration	
Person Responsible	Kristen McAdams (kristenmcadams@marion.k12.fl.us)
Professional Development	
Person Responsible	Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)
Reading support support for bottom quartile	
Person Responsible	Kristen McAdams (kristenmcadams@marion.k12.fl.us)
Differentiated lessons based on student learning needs	
Person Responsible	Kristen McAdams (kristenmcadams@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Process: Family Engagement Rationale This plan will describe our commitment to engage parents and families in the education of their children and to build the capacity to implement family engagement strategies and activities designed to achieve the school and student academic achievement goals.
Measurable Outcome:	If we focus parent and family engagement activities in ELA, Math, Science promoting proficiency for students and building a foundation in the primary grades then proficiency will increase as measured by FSA. ELA from 36% to 40% Math from 43% to 47% Science from 47% to 51%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Engaging families in standards based activities assists with furthering the education at home and increasing proficiency and learning gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Parent and Family Engagement means the participation of parents and family members in ongoing consultation and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including ensuring that: (A) Parents and families play an integral role in assisting their child's learning. (B) Parents and families are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education. (C) Parents and families are full partners in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child. (D) The carrying out of other activities, such as those described under ESSA Section 1116.

Action Steps to Implement	
Title I Annual Meeting	
Person Responsible	Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)
Teacher Led Standards	
Person Responsible	Melicia Cooper (melicia.cooper@marion.k12.fl.us)
Fall into Reading	
Person Responsible	Kristen McAdams (kristenmcadams@marion.k12.fl.us)
Spring Into Love w/Learning	
Person Responsible	Rachel Keene (rachel.keene@marion.k12.fl.us)
Digging Science	
Person Responsible	Rachel Keene (rachel.keene@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:
• A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
• Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
• Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
• Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
• Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
• Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
• Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00