Marion County Public Schools

Legacy Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Legacy Elementary School

8496 JUNIPER RD, Ocala, FL 34480

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Shameka Murphy

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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

Legacy Elementary School

8496 JUNIPER RD, Ocala, FL 34480

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

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

Positive caring educators will provide a rigorous curriculum incorporating high expectations with emphasis on character education. Legacy Elementary students will be responsible and respectful members of the community who take pride in all they do.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learning with Pride...Leaving a Legacy.

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
Murphy, Shameka	Principal	The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision–making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need; and communicates with parents as necessary.
Page, Ashley	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.
Swain, Angela	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.
Epps, Tonya	Administrative Support	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.
Bryant, Charnee	Administrative Support	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Math/Science 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.
Schooley, Morgan	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.
Atchley, Jill	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families
Curty, Marie-Elena	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, Shameka Murphy

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.*

20

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.*

28

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	62	102	112	130	156	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	680
Attendance below 90 percent	11	25	35	36	40	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	3	3	9	37	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in ELA	0	6	9	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	6	9	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	1	15	30	51	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	9	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/12/2020

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	105	136	132	148	145	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	804
Attendance below 90 percent	18	35	12	23	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	3	10	10	21	29	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	14	22	10	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	66	57	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	10	26	39	49	48	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250

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	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	105	136	132	148	145	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	804
Attendance below 90 percent	18	35	12	23	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	3	10	10	21	29	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	14	22	10	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	66	57	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	10	26	39	49	48	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250

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	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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%	53%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	51%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	53%	39%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	45%	51%	63%	56%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	58%	62%	49%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	49%	51%	35%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	47%	53%	56%	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	43%	44%	-1%	58%	-15%
	2018	41%	46%	-5%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	49%	-5%	58%	-14%
	2018	38%	43%	-5%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	39%	45%	-6%	56%	-17%
	2018	37%	46%	-9%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	42%	49%	-7%	62%	-20%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	54%	-3%	64%	-13%
	2018	39%	47%	-8%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	33%	45%	-12%	60%	-27%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	44%	-4%	53%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	39%	49%	-10%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	14	40	30	20	44	43	24				
ELL	21	36		30	57	73	42				
BLK	34	53	54	32	46	26	28				
HSP	36	51	47	39	54	67	36				
MUL	47	17		53	67						
WHT	53	53	45	56	60	45	49				
FRL	38	52	53	38	52	40	38				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	33	30	26	52	46	26				
ELL	20	18		32	35						
BLK	25	33	37	36	47	33	21				
HSP	33	32	25	52	49		13				
MUL	38	40		58	47		50				
WHT	50	42	8	53	63	48	60				
FRL	36	36	29	44	53	34	37				

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	31	32	17	32	32	29	30				
ELL	38			55	30						
BLK	37	42	30	37	39	37	36				
HSP	52	46	55	63	53	46	50				
MUL	33	50		33	42						
WHT	63	58	39	63	54	24	67				
FRL	46	47	33	51	48	36	47				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
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	39
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	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
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	47
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 science proficiency had the lowest performance with 39%. There has been a decrease in science proficiency since 16-17 school year. The drop in science proficiency from 16-17 school year (56%) to the 17-18 school year (39%) was 17% percentage points. The science proficiency form 17-18 school year to 18-19 school year remained the same. Continue to focus on understanding the standards and aligning the resources
and materials to the depth of the Science standards.

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

Math proficiency dropped 3 percentage points. During math blocks there was no remediation and enrichment built in. The focus will be to provide time for remediation and enrichment during the math

blocks.Continue to focus more on bottom quartile students and not providing enrichment to the on and above students.

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.

Math proficiency had the greatest gap of 18 percentage points when compared to the state average. There has been a decrease in math proficiency since 17-18 school year. The drop from 16-17 school year (56%) to the 17-18 school year (48%) was 8% percentage points. The math proficiency from 17-18 school year (48%) to 18-19 school year (45%) was 3% percentage points. We did not focus on remediation and enrichment during math blocks due to allocated time.

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

ELA bottom quartile improved 19 percentage points. Teachers during data meetings tracked student progress and created plans for students that needed remediation of specific standards and adjusted the intervention based on individual student needs.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data the area of focus will be attendance and suspensions. Poor attendance has an negative impact on student learning. Students need to be present to receive instruction.

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

1. Improve proficiency in ELA
2. Improve proficiency in Math
3. Improve proficiency in Science
4. Improve the Federal Index for black/African Americans and students with disabilities
5. Improve Attendance rate (including decrease in out of school suspension)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A need to improve instructional practice through collaborative planning was identified during school's administrators' debriefing of walkthroughs, informal and formal observations. It was evident that some teachers were not familiar or did not have a deep understanding of their content area standards preventing them from properly aligning instructional materials to the standards and teaching practice. This ultimately affected student engagement and performance in ELA, Math and Science.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide teachers with supported collaboration opportunities focusing on standards based lesson planning (Backwards Design lesson planning) then the following will improve on the state assessments: ELA student learning gains from 51% to 56% ELA lowest 25% percentile from 46% to 51% ELA student proficiency from 43% to 48% Math student learning gains from 55% to 60% Math lowest 25% percentile from 45% to 50% Math student proficiency from 45% to 50% Science student proficiency from 39% to 44%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome of improving instructional practice is collaborative planning focused on understanding the standards and utilizing instructional materials aligned to the standards. Every Tuesday, LES will provide instructional staff with collaboration planning opportunities allowing teachers to unpack standards and develop standard based lesson plans. The schedule is as follows: - Math/ELA (Kg-2nd) will alternate each week - Math/ELA (3rd-5th will meet by department every Tuesday
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers work collectively to deepen their knowledge of the curriculum, it has a positive impact on improving student achievement. Sharing best practices and utilizing instructional materials that align to the depth of the standards also has a positive impact on student achievement. The article written by Carla Thomas McClure "The benefits of teacher collaboration" it states, "to determine the relationship between teacher collaboration and student achievement, the researchers used reading and math achievements scores for 2, 536 fourth-graders, controlling for school context and student characteristics such as prior achievement. They found a positive relationship between teacher collaboration and differences among schools in mathematics and reading achievement."

Action Steps to Implement	
Provide professional development on high yield strategies for teachers.	
Person Responsible	Marie-Elena Curty (marie-elena.curty@marion.k12.fl.us)
Provide collaboration opportunities every Tuesdays of the week for teachers to unpack standards and develop standard based lesson plans. (Math/ELA - K-2 alternate each week and 3-5 departmentalized meet every Tuesday)	

Person Responsible	Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide collaboration opportunities every 1st and 3rd Thursdays of the week for teachers to review data to drive instruction.

Person Responsible	Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

Administration will utilize classroom observation to ensure fidelity of the implementation, provide timely feedback and follow through to determine next steps.

Person Responsible	Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A need to improve literacy of ALL students but particularly our Students with Disabilities and Black/African American subgroups was identified during the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 debriefing of FSA, iReady diagnostics, and QSMA's data. It was evident that students who struggled with reading were unsuccessful when attempted to make sense of, and engage in advanced reading, writing, listening and speaking. This ultimately prevented them from comprehending the content of other subject areas which impacted student academic performance.
Measurable Outcome:	If we integrate literacy across content areas with differentiated instruction then the number of students in subgroups Student with Disabilities and Black/African American federal index will increase to 41% proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome of improving literacy of ALL students but particularly our Students with Disabilities and Black/ African American subgroups is the integration of literacy across content areas, infused with differentiated instruction. LES will utilize i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments (ELA and Math) to determine students' needs, and develop a personalized learning path based on data and trends analysis. LES will utilize STEMscopes to boost inquiry based instruction, literacy development, and hands on investigation. It will provide an avenue to nurture students' curiosity through a flexible curriculum. This curriculum follows the 5E + intervention and acceleration model and is available in print, digital and kit in order to meet students' unique learning needs. Administration will utilize classroom observation to ensure fidelity of the implementation, provide timely feedback and follow through to determine next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	i-Ready diagnostic scores are strongly correlated with the scores on the FSA administered to students. Research also indicates that students achieve greater gains with at least 30-49 minutes per subject per week of i-Ready online instruction. This provides additional support to students to improve their reading. Schools that used STEMscopes improved their science proficiency by 3 percentage points on average. The results support previous research showing that inquiring-based science instruction has a cumulative effect on student science achievement. The more exposure students had to inquiry-based science through STEMscopes, the better they performed on the Florida state science assessment.

Action Steps to Implement	
Provide professional development for teachers on literacy and instructional strategies across the content areas. We will have a school wide emphasis on writing which will be used in all content areas.	
Person Responsible	Tonya Epps (tonya.epps@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide collaboration opportunities every Tuesday of the week for teachers to plan lessons and share best practices.

Person Responsible Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers utilize I-Ready tool box to use with students to improve literacy. Students will use I-Ready online program and workbooks as a supplement to assist in improving literacy.

Person Responsible Angela Swain (angela.swain@marion.k12.fl.us)

5th grade teachers will use STEMScope and kits as a supplement to assist in improving literacy.

Person Responsible Charnee Bryant (charnee.bryant@marion.k12.fl.us)

Paraprofessional working with teacher and students to improve student achievement during class and MTSS block.

Person Responsible Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

Administration will utilize classroom observation to ensure fidelity of the implementation, provide timely feedback and follow through to determine next steps.

Person Responsible Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A need to enhance students' confidence and ability to think, express and retain or solidify mathematical knowledge was evident during the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 debriefing of FSA, iReady diagnostics, and QSMA's data. The results revealed that students were unsuccessful when attempted to transition from concrete thinking into abstract and mental math processes. This ultimately affected student engagement and academic performance in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	If we focus on developing students' Numbers Sense abilities through data analysis, hands on learning, small group instruction, and informal classroom assessments then the number of students scoring a 3 or higher in the Math FSA will increase from 45% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategies being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome of developing students' Number Sense abilities are Number Talks and Small group instruction. Number Talks (Math) provides a short and structured way for students to think, ask their peers questions, and explain their own thinking. Teachers will have an opportunity to monitor the effectiveness of the strategy and make changes every time its used.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction allows the teachers to provide struggling students with: - Personalize instruction to evaluate students' learning strengths, locate gaps, and tailor instruction to specific learners' needs - Frequent and individualized feedback focused on improving specific reading or math skills - Reteach or pre-teach important skills or key concepts (e.g., phonemic awareness skill of manipulating ending sounds, or operations with whole numbers or rational numbers). - Build confidence through collaboration and teamwork Number talks is to support students' mathematical sense making and promote flexible thinking. Provides opportunity for students to develop number sense focused on making sense of quantity and mathematical relationships. Helps students understand that there can be many ways to solve a mathematics problem. Providing opportunities to explain their reasoning will assist in improving student achievement in math. Small group instruction by the teacher will build students' confidence, close achievement gaps, and accelerates learning.

Action Steps to Implement	
Provide professional development on number talks for teachers and small group instruction.	
Person Responsible	Charnee Bryant (charnee.bryant@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide collaboration opportunities every Tuesdays of the week for teachers to discuss best practices and next standard to address during instruction.

Person Responsible Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide collaboration opportunities every 1st and 3rd Thursdays of the week for teachers to review data to drive instruction centered around number talks and small group instruction (remediation/acceleration).

Person Responsible Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

Administration will utilize classroom observation to ensure fidelity of the implementation, provide timely feedback and follow through to determine next steps.

Person Responsible Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@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.

We will also focus on incorporating more labs in science lesson plans during collaborative planning.

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 will provide opportunities for parents, families, and other community stakeholder to participate in events that will build positive relationships and assist in fulfilling the school's mission and support the needs of students. The parents, families, and other community stakeholders will have opportunities to make suggestions and give feedback about the programs currently being utilized.

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: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00