Harbour View Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Harbour View Elementary School

8445 SE 147TH PL, Summerfield, FL 34491

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Joy Baxley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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

Harbour View Elementary School

8445 SE 147TH PL, Summerfield, FL 34491

[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	41%

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 at Harbour View Elementary is to create an innovative environment where All children, regardless of differences, will excel. We are dedicated to excellence in education so that each child will become a productive citizen in an ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are dedicated to excellence in education so that each child will become a productive citizen in an ever-changing world.

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
Light, Vera	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Swinehart, Charolette	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.
Hensel, Rob	Principal	The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. He provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision–making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need; and communicates with parents as necessary.
Smith, Mitzi	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.
Salem, Sheri	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.
Nettles-Brown, Jannissa	Dean	Our dean will model and teach school wide expectations for our students and support teachers with implementing their classroom expectations. Our dean

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		will focus on building relationships with students in order to help them create educational plans that ensure improved academic success. Our dean will also provide strategies and resources so our faculty and staff can also build successful relationships with our students.
Pollard, Jennifer	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Joy Baxley

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.*

3

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

55

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 (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (50%)

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	118	121	114	135	135	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	63	36	47	56	55	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	302
One or more suspensions	3	7	7	10	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	3	7	38	16	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Course failure in Math	2	7	26	15	27	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	37	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	42	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
	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	8	12	30	15	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 7/22/2020

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	123	117	134	147	135	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803
Attendance below 90 percent	24	23	24	26	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	6	10	9	16	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	4	31	8	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	65	63	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	12	16	37	29	27	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	123	117	134	147	135	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803
Attendance below 90 percent	24	23	24	26	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	6	10	9	16	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	4	31	8	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	65	63	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	12	16	37	29	27	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	43%	47%	57%	46%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	51%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	52%	53%	52%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	46%	51%	63%	54%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	58%	62%	66%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	49%	51%	48%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	47%	53%	53%	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	38%	44%	-6%	58%	-20%
	2018	41%	46%	-5%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	49%	-6%	58%	-15%
	2018	40%	43%	-3%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	42%	49%	-7%	62%	-20%
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	54%	-15%	64%	-25%
	2018	44%	47%	-3%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	51%	45%	6%	60%	-9%
	2018	68%	50%	18%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	44%	7%	53%	-2%
	2018	66%	49%	17%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
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	19	30	28	27	43	42	22				
ELL	25	30	9	32	41	38	36				
BLK	34	47		35	53		20				
HSP	40	41	26	41	48	41	45				
MUL	40	56		46	33		40				
WHT	45	58	48	50	53	47	59				
FRL	37	50	42	40	49	46	43				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	40	52	25	36	30	18				
ELL	20	41	39	41	43	35	31				
BLK	29	28		43	47		50				
HSP	35	41	45	48	49	33	63				
MUL	38	33		52	53						
WHT	46	46	58	53	58	41	71				
FRL	37	44	54	47	52	43	64				

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	11	38	41	18	47	42	30				
ELL	17	43	60	40	63	62	27				
BLK	36	53		45	61						
HSP	34	52	58	50	69	68	48				
MUL	50			57							
WHT	53	51	47	58	64	38	56				
FRL	42	53	60	51	66	46	48				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	366
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	43
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	51
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	43
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 bottom quartile in math learning gains only showed 41%. The amount of time allocated for math remediation and the lack of math interventions in 2018-19 both attributed to this component.

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

In 2018-19 our NGSSS science data declined 14 percentage points from the previous year. This was a new cohort of students who took the exam. This group of students had more struggling/non-proficient readers than the previous 5th grade students who took the exam.

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.

In 2018-19 our math achievement was 17 percentage points below the state average. The amount of time allocated for math attributed to this gap. The school struggled with identifying appropriate and available math resources.

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

In 2018-19 our ELA learning gains improved 9 percentage points from the previous year. Our school implemented What I Need (WIN) Time for our ELA remediation this past school year. Our students received remediation from a certified teacher based on their needs. The groups were also fluid and changed, if necessary, based on students' needs.

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

Attendance- less than 90%
Course failures of ELA and math courses

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

1. If teachers incorporate higher-level questioning and discourse in academic instruction, then targeted students identified with a Federal Index below 41% will show an increase in proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math as measured by the 2020-21 FSA.
2. If teachers incorporate inquiry/problem solving focus into their science instruction, then our school will show an increase of proficiency of 4% (to 55%) on the SY2021 FCAT Science assessment.
3.If teachers and staff focus on building relationships with our students through student engagement, then our students' ELA and math course failures will be reduced by 50 students (124 total).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We saw that our three ESSA sub groups, African-Americans, SWD, & ELL, were falling short of their peers on state assessments. We also saw the lack of higher order questioning in our teachers' classrooms during walk throughs and observations. We know that asking those higher order questions increases the students' understanding and advances their cognitive abilities- across all subjects. So we saw this as a need for our students, but also as an area where our teachers can improve.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers incorporate higher-level questioning and discourse in academic instruction, then targeted students identified with a Federal Index below 41% will show an increase in proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math as measured by the 2020-21 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will incorporate higher-level questioning and discourse in their academic instruction. They will increase the amount of higher-level questions used in their subject areas. In turn, this will lead to a greater understanding of the subject matter by their students. This will be monitored by administration through classroom walkthroughs as well as planning in PLC meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Educators often use Bloom's Taxonomy to create learning outcomes that target not only subject matter but also the depth of learning they want students to achieve, and to then create assessments that accurately report on students' progress towards these outcomes (Anderson, L., & Krathwohl, D. A. (2001). Taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York: Longman).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet with staff for a basic, entry level of understanding of Bloom's work, how each level progresses, and how Bloom's Taxonomy has been revised by other researchers. We will begin to build the foundation of how higher-level questioning and discourse in the classroom leads to students' deeper understanding and connection to the subject matter.
2. Teachers given question stems to use in their lessons. They will begin practicing using them within their daily discourse with students.
3. Teachers will be asked to bring a higher-level question to each PLC for ELA and math. These will be incorporated into their weekly collaborative planning documents.
4. Administration will monitor teachers use of higher order questioning and discourse via classroom observations, walk throughs, PLCs, and conversations.

Person Responsible	Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We saw that our science scores had decreased in SY2018-19. From observations and walk throughs of teachers' classrooms during science instruction, we knew there was room for improvement in the area of science. One aspect that was lacking was the students' use of inquiry/problem solving skills during their science instruction. We know that by using these skills that students develop a deeper understanding and connection with the science material, concepts, and knowledge.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers incorporate inquiry/problem solving focus into their science instruction, then our school will show an increase of proficiency of 4% (to 55%) on the SY2021 FCAT Science assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheri Salem (sheri.salem@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inquiry-based science and problem solving adopts an investigative approach to teaching and learning where students are provided with opportunities to investigate a problem, search for possible solutions, make observations, ask questions, test out ideas, and think creatively and use their intuition. This will be monitored by administration through classroom walkthroughs as well as planning in PLC meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"Guided inquiry-based learning has been proposed as a promising approach to science education. Students are encouraged to gather information, use this information to iteratively formulate and test hypotheses, draw conclusions, and report their findings. However, students may not automatically follow this prescribed sequence of steps in open-ended learning environments. Results indicate that students' quantity of information-gathering behaviors has a greater impact on content learning gains than adherence to a particular sequence of problem-solving steps. ...Information gathering prior to hypothesis generation is correlated with improved initial hypotheses and problem-solving efficiency." (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg Website accessed on July 31, 2019: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-30950-2_60)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review the 5 E model with staff.
2. Review standards, STEM Scopes, and Science Dailies with staff.
3. Train staff on inquiry and problem solving process.
4. Science CAS will model inquiry and problem solving science lab (or classroom) for each grade level in the science lab.
5. Science CAS will monitor this process with staff through walk throughs, observations, PLCs, and conversations.

Person Responsible	Sheri Salem (sheri.salem@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reviewing our EWS data, we discovered we had many students who obtained grades of U or F for ELA and math courses. Our area of focus is decreasing the amount of students receiving grades of F or U. Teachers will be building relationships and presenting engaging lessons in order to decrease the number of students receiving grades of F or U.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers and staff focus on building relationships with our students through student engagement, then our students' ELA and math course failures will be reduced by 50 students (124 total). Teachers will be greeting students at the door before school begins each day and making positive phone calls to parents at the start of the year. Administration will monitor progress of these actions during walkthroughs and PLC meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mitzi Smith (smith.mitzi@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers building meaningful relationships with their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A strong teacher-student relationship is associated with higher student academic engagement, attendance, and grades. (Sparks, S. "Why Teacher-Student Relationships Matter." published March 12, 2019 in Education Week.)

Action Steps to Implement

Review why teacher-student relationships are so vital to a students' growth and achievement.

Person Responsible	Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)

Discuss strategies learned at ICLE conference this summer and how to implement them into classroom-day one

Person Responsible	Mitzi Smith (smith.mitzi@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monthly PLC meetings will discuss, share, research new strategies, ideas, and techniques on how to continue to build teacher-student relationships.

Person Responsible	Mitzi Smith (smith.mitzi@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor students' progress in ELA and math at each progress report and report card. Set up conferences with students who are receiving Us and Fs in ELA and math in order to encourage them and/or find out what help they could use in order to improve their grades.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Pollard (jennifer.pollard@marion.k12.fl.us)

Reward students who have improved one or both grades each quarter.

Person Responsible	Vera Light (vera.light@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.

Attendance- less than 90%
Our student average daily attendance rate for SY2018-19 was 85%. If teachers and staff focus on building relationships with our students through student engagement, then our students' attendance rate will increase three percentage points to 88% for the 2020-21 school year.

Staff will be trained on how to build relationships with families and students via Sanford Harmony.
Staff will be given statistics and information as to how and why student and staff attendance impacts student achievement.

The school will offer incentives (not purchased out of Title I funding) to students who have perfect attendance each month, quarter, and for the whole year. As the year progresses, habitually absent students will receive phone calls, CST meetings, and meetings/check-ins from assigned staff.

Harmony is a program that develops children's social emotional learning. Social emotional learning (SEL) is the process through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary for being a healthy adult. This includes problem-solving skills, as well as teaching kids to embrace diversity and build healthy relationships that will last well into adulthood.

1. **Train staff on how to use and deliver the Sanford Harmony curriculum**
2. **Introduce and train students on how to use Sanford Harmony**
3. **Plan school attendance incentives for each quarter and the whole year**
4. **Hold PST meetings to develop plans to increase habitually absent students' attendance rates**

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.

The school's mission, vision, and events are communicated to parents through a monthly newsletter, SAC Committee Meetings, Annual Title 1 Parent Meeting and Open House. Harbour View Elementary School involves parents through conferences both face to face and over the phone. (We will definitely start the year with more telephone and electronic communication until the virus passes.) Grade level and subject area parent events/training are provided throughout the school year. Based on feedback from parents, these events have been scheduled mainly in the afternoons. Classrooms have been opened to parent volunteers.

(However, this is on hold until the virus passes.) Parents and family members have been encouraged to become approved volunteers so they will have an opportunity to become comfortable with and interact with the school setting on a first hand basis. Tutors for Kids, Villages Rotary Evening Club, and Hispanic Club of The Villages have committed to tutoring and/or mentoring our students. The Villages Rotary Evening Club has committed to have a member on our SAC. Hispanic Club of The Villages has committed to help with one of our identified ESSA

subgroups: ELL students. Village View Church gives our students supplies and hosts an after school club (which will be on hold until the virus passes) for them as well. Village View also beautifies our school throughout the year via service projects.

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: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00