Wyomina Park Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wyomina Park Elementary School

511 NE 12TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34470

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Victoria Hunt

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2020

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 (46%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: F (31%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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

Wyomina Park Elementary School

511 NE 12TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34470

[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	69%

School Grades History

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

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.

To
Learn and lead by
Empowering all stakeholders to
Access the skills required to fully
Develop as successful citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learn and lead to succeed.

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
Baxley, Joy	Principal	Maintain a focus on safety and student achievement, providing leadership and vision and holding stakeholders accountable for their contributions.
Hughes, Jolene	Administrative Support	Support principal, handle money, orders, contracts, PD, stipends
Howell, Margaret	Instructional Coach	Support teachers through science lab model lessons, pulling materials, providing resources, organizing STEM Showcase, managing SFSF Science night. Coach teachers designated by admin in Domain 2 and Domain 3 elements of teacher evaluation rubric.
Mesnick, Cassandra	School Counselor	Support students through attendance programs, career awareness, MTSS for academics and behavior, outsource student mental health needs if needed, run MDT team
Macias, Lisa	Dean	Support teachers through PBIS, Leader in Me , Zones of Regulation, discipline referrals, engage families in the process of raising good citizens
Eatmon, Susan	Assistant Principal	Support principal in maintaining a focus on safety and student achievement, providing leadership and vision and holding stakeholders accountable for their contributions. Support teachers in regular collaborative planning, location and distribution of resources, and interventions. Hold teachers accountable.
Von Ohlen, Nancy	Instructional Coach	Support teachers through model lessons, pulling materials, and providing resources. Attend Collaborative Planning and assist in planning process. Work in determining math intervention, training personnel, and distributing resources and gathering MTSS paperwork. Coach teachers designated by admin in Domain 2 and Domain 3 elements of teacher evaluation rubric.
Greenbaum, Howard	Assistant Principal	Support principal in maintaining a focus on safety and student achievement, providing leadership and vision and holding stakeholders accountable for their contributions. Support teachers in regular collaborative planning, location and distribution of resources, and interventions. Hold teachers accountable.
Smith, Julie	Dean	Build relationships with students and address discipline issues
Hamilton, Brandy	Other	Coach teachers and support ELA intervention and collaborative planning

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/29/2020, Victoria Hunt

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.*

2

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

43

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 (46%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: F (31%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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	99	90	85	90	60	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	23	22	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	4	7	2	11	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	11	18	14	13	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	11	18	14	13	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/29/2020

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	100	95	101	75	76	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Attendance below 90 percent	31	22	20	13	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	20	22	24	21	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	12	21	9	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	49	43	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	25	27	44	32	37	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	100	95	101	75	76	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Attendance below 90 percent	31	22	20	13	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	20	22	24	21	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	12	21	9	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	49	43	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	25	27	44	32	37	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	34%	47%	57%	30%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	56%	58%	29%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	53%	20%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	32%	51%	63%	29%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	58%	62%	36%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	49%	51%	33%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	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	21%	44%	-23%	58%	-37%
	2018	36%	46%	-10%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	49%	-13%	58%	-22%
	2018	30%	43%	-13%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
	2018	35%	46%	-11%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	24%	49%	-25%	62%	-38%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	54%	-18%	64%	-28%
	2018	33%	47%	-14%	62%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	39%	45%	-6%	60%	-21%
	2018	40%	50%	-10%	61%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	44%	-6%	53%	-15%
	2018	38%	49%	-11%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	7	32	15	3	64	67	10				
ELL	6	31		6	68	80					
BLK	30	53	56	26	55	60	40				
HSP	23	39		29	67	67	42				
MUL	43			36							
WHT	41	48	30	38	56		47				
FRL	30	44	41	28	57	56	37				
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	14	43	33	23	29	9	50				
ELL	11	50		6	40						
BLK	20	46	56	30	42	24	12				
HSP	34	49	36	34	56	36	39				
MUL	17	50		11	14		20				
WHT	48	67		58	63		64				
FRL	31	50	47	36	48	35	32				

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
**2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**
SWD	26	14		21	33	27					
ELL	11	20	18	11	25	27					
BLK	17	24	19	19	30	30	12				
HSP	29	24	17	24	33	38	40				
MUL	29	14		25	31						
WHT	45	41		42	45		50				
FRL	25	27	21	24	35	37	28				

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	48
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	43
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	46
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	48
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
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.

Our data was worst in the Math Achievement component, with only 32% of our students proficient. The focus of fact fluency was clearly not sufficient to address the standards to the proper depth in each strand. Our math instruction time each day was reduced by the district, and we continued a focus on reading and our new reading curriculum materials.

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

Our greatest decline was also in the area of Math Achievement. The focus of fact fluency was clearly not sufficient to address the standards to the proper depth in each strand. Our math instruction time each day was reduced by the district, and we continued a focus on reading and our new reading curriculum materials.

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.

Our greatest gaps with the state were in 3rd grade, in reading as well as math proficiency. We were 37% below in Reading, and 38% below in Math. Students arrived from second grade with instructional gaps, which wer obviously well addressed as evidenced by our math learning. However, the time spent filling gaps left less time to address the grade level standards in such a way as to increase proficiency in math.

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

Our Math Learning Gains in the Lowest Quartile increased by 25 points. We piloted a program called Reflex Math, which worked with Students on fact fluency. We saw great mastery in the program as we recognized students on the morning show. Our Math CAS also worked with this group doing intervention in the Spring, and she taught them how to use their drawn multiplication chart to find equivalent fractions. In addition. most teachers in 3rd grade used Zearn.

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

Our areas of greatest concern are in the areas of Attendance and Discipline, as we show high numbers of student's missing more than 10% of the school year, and many receiving one or more discipline referrals. Students who are not in class can not learn!!

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

1. Authentic Literacy to increase Math Learning gains and Achievement
2. Attendance and Discipline
3. Parent Engagement
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our state test data, we concluded students need to have the opportunity to read, write, speak and think every day, especially in reading and math. These opportunities will allow the students to grow and develop academically as well as give teachers daily, continual feedback about student learning. This daily, formative feedback will provide teachers with the information needed to adjust instruction so that every student can learn and be successful.
Measurable Outcome:	IF teachers provide students with the opportunity to read, write, speak and think in reading and math every day, they will develop a deeper understanding of grade level standards and concepts, and use academic vocabulary and our proficiency will increase in ELA, Math and Science, especially for student groups identified as under-performing on the Federal Index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be using weekly collaborative planning with grade level groups, content area specialists, and administrators to create authentic literacy opportunities in reading and math. This will then be monitored by administrators observing in classrooms and providing strategic feedback to teachers on effectiveness.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that teacher collaboration helps raise student achievement and classroom observations have great potential for improving teaching and learning. Our content area specialists will create relationships with teachers that provide safe opportunities for teachers to work with them and plan effective lessons, with rigor and relevance as our main objectives, with the assistance of our MCPS curriculum maps and FSA Item Specifications. Using these strategies will help improve teaching strategies and learning for all students. These opportunities will allow the students to grow and develop academically, as well as give teachers daily, continual feedback of student learning. This daily, formative feedback will provide teachers with the information needed to help every student learn and be successful.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide 90 - minute ELA block and 75- minute math block training to include small group rotations, whole group instruction, scaffolding and differentiation for grades K-1/2-5

Person Responsible	Brandy Hamilton (brandy.hamilton@marion.k12.fl.us)

Solicit each teacher's 90 - minute plan for ELA instruction and 75 minute plan for math instruction – provide several template options

Person Responsible	Brandy Hamilton (brandy.hamilton@marion.k12.fl.us)

Experienced teacher to provide Versa tiles training to support purchased ELA and Math kits.

Person Responsible	Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Review STRaW (Speak, Think, Read, and Write) and engagement strategies with Kagan resources and new social distancing guidelines. Make specific plans during collaborative planning for ELA, then scaffold into math.

Person Responsible Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Develop schedule for admin and CAS walk throughs

Person Responsible Susan Eatmon (susan.eatmon@marion.k12.fl.us)

Recognition of successes, encouragement

Person Responsible Nancy Von Ohlen (nancy.vonohlen@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide Intervention training and support

Person Responsible Margaret Howell (margaret.howell@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide Vocabulary Kit Training and support.

Person Responsible Susan Eatmon (susan.eatmon@marion.k12.fl.us)

Develop and implement mentoring plan for teachers new to county, new to our school and new to a grade level.

Person Responsible Susan Eatmon (susan.eatmon@marion.k12.fl.us)

Pour any available resources in to 5th grade and 4th grade prior retainees.

Person Responsible Susan Eatmon (susan.eatmon@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Promoting and developing a culture that it is "Cool to be in School" is based on the foundation that connecting students and teachers through the power of relationships and mutual understanding empowers under performing students to achieve higher rates of attendance and lowers their number of disciplinary incidents resulting in higher levels of academic achievement. These relationships allow for more engaging and enriching educational activities that define a sense of purpose and provide a pathway to success for under performing students.
Measurable Outcome:	IF we implement Sanford Harmony and Leader in Me through the designated daily scheduled time, then students will feel supported and accepted, and learn social-emotional skills as well as leadership skills to change our school culture and make our school the place they want to be. The measurable outcomes of implementing these programs will be an increase in the percentage of students who attend school 90% of the time or more from 76% to 80% and a reduction in the number students involved in incidents resulting in suspension from 25% to 20%, especially for our underperforming students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Macias (lisa.macias@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The two major evidence based strategies we are using are Sanford Harmony and The Leader in Me. Sanford Harmony is monitored through the use of behavior screening tools and accountability logs monitored at both the school and district level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The two major evidence based strategies we are using are Sanford Harmony and The Leader in Me. Sanford Harmony is implemented in Elementary schools district wide and fits in with our pre-established Teaching with Love and Logic framework. It is monitored through the use of behavior screening tools and accountability logs monitored at both the school and district level. The

Leader in Me is a book/book study model that combines the seven highly
effective behaviors of students and through that foundation promotes
pathways to success for all students. We monitor its success through student
and family participation in activities and events as well as student specific
disciplinary incident data and trend data.

Action Steps to Implement

Use TSSSA funds to hire full time on campus counselor for students and staff needs.

| **Person Responsible** | Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Use and tracking of Sanford Harmony BESS Screeners and Response logs, continue to promote and address mental health issues and awareness and mindfulness through monthly bathroom posters and student post-Covid surveys. Monitor and address racial issues and they arise. Address on Morning Show.

| **Person Responsible** | Cassandra Mesnick (cassandra.mesnick@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Convene MDT team and meet regularly to assess student needs, and make action plans.

| **Person Responsible** | Cassandra Mesnick (cassandra.mesnick@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 issues, especially, and hold a gift card drawing for parents based on students who are on time for school according to a predetermined criteria. Use a choice sheet for parents to select what they might want to work for. Student with tardy issues who are on time could get a pass to work on the computer or do something special like set up for PE.

| **Person Responsible** | Cassandra Mesnick (cassandra.mesnick@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Conduct frequent monitoring of student attendance and discipline data, action plan to address issues.

| **Person Responsible** | Julie Smith (julie.smith1@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Continue implementation of, Character Development
Academy, PBIS and Love and Logic, providing ways for new staff members to get caught up on these programs through mentoring and resources posted on SharePoint,

| **Person Responsible** | Julie Smith (julie.smith1@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Require all teachers to conduct the Morning Meeting as prescribed by Sanford Harmony and supported by Leader n Me.

| **Person Responsible** | Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Move PBIS Warrior Store to Media Center to promote more regular use at the end of media classes, and display items as motivation.

| **Person Responsible** | Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us) |

#3. Other specifically relating to Parent Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Many families do not have a full understanding of what happens during the school day and may miss the importance of having kids at school on time every day, and letting them complete each day. By involving them in the 7 Habits of Highly Effective Kids/Families, will will assist them in making those connections, as well as provide strategies for improvement.
Measurable Outcome:	IF we implement Strong Fathers, Strong Families, and incorporate training on the 7 Habits of Highly Effective Families, then families will be able to assist students to develop a deeper understanding of grade level standards and concepts, and use academic vocabulary and our ELA proficiency will increase in ELA, Math and Science, especially for student groups identified as under performing on the Federal Index. This means our ELA proficiency would increase from 34% to 37%, our Math proficiency would increase from 32% to 35%, and our Science Proficiency from 41% to 45%. Our ELA Learning gains would increase to 50%, for both regular students and the lowest quartile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Howard Greenbaum (howard.greenbaum@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strong Fathers, Strong Families programs have proved successful in the past, and the & Habits of Highly Effective Kids we are implementing at school is having a positive impact. We want to build on this momentum by offering review of and training in the 7 Habits and ensuring that our Math and Science and Reading Night events are aligned to Florida Standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are selecting strategies that have been successful in the past, and will continue to ensure that we offer food, childcare, interpreters, and hold events at different times of day in order to meets the needs of as many families as possible. We will use the 7 Habits of Highly Effective Families materials provided through Leader in Me, and the Strong Fathers, Strong Families resources provided after district training. Plans may have to be made virtual under CC guidelines.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide training and support for teachers to add 7 Habits information and activity links to their teacher website.

Person Responsible	Margaret Howell (margaret.howell@marion.k12.fl.us)

Upload a video to the school website of how to participate in a ZOOM training; post link on Twitter feed and send a Skylert and PeachJar flyer.

Person Responsible	Howard Greenbaum (howard.greenbaum@marion.k12.fl.us)

Use leftover Adventure Awaits summer bags to send home for those who are behind, and send links to the various summer activities they missed.

Person Responsible	Margaret Howell (margaret.howell@marion.k12.fl.us)

Consider Microsoft Team training for teachers and parents to access video resources, create and post video training.

Person Responsible	Howard Greenbaum (howard.greenbaum@marion.k12.fl.us)

Hold Open Houses, Title 1 Meeting, Introduction of Habit 1, Be Proactive - schedule 1 class per grade throughout the day for social distancing, Hold Title 1 meeting virtually.

Person Responsible	Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

none

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 are Warriors - we say a pledge each morning to remind us what that means:

We are Responsible, we are respectful, we are ready to learn and lead.
We stand for safety and learning, we stand against bullying and racism.

TODAY we will walk the Warrior way!

Leader in Me is how we are building our school culture, and making it cool to be in school. Positive sayings are painted everywhere, even in the bathrooms! We are including parents in our Leader in Me culture through the 7 Habits of Highly Effective Families training.

Every day is a great day at The Park!

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: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Parent Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**