

Marion County Public Schools

Maplewood Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Maplewood Elementary School

4751 SE 24TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christine Carter

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)	99%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Maplewood Elementary School

4751 SE 24TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[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	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

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

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.

Maplewood is a school where all children can learn and develop to their fullest potential. Each student's success is based upon the school, home, and community working side by side to ensure that each child will become a life-long learner and develop a sense of self worth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Side by Side For Success.

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
DiSanza, Christine	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. Supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school
Martin, James	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.
Hodges, Phyllis	Instructional Coach	
Hipke, Beth	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content.
Gravel, Rebecca	School Counselor	To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.
Hilton, Kelly	School Counselor	To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.
Guynn, Shay	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, Christine Carter

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.*

4

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

68

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)	99%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	74	116	119	97	128	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	22	59	58	43	57	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	302
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	15	15	26	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	1	15	15	25	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
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	1	12	14	16	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 8/5/2020

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	77	117	100	120	120	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	15	7	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	4	4	2	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	7	10	16	22	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	48	30	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	17	20	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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

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	77	117	100	120	120	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	15	7	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	4	4	2	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	7	10	16	22	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	48	30	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	17	20	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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

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	46%	47%	57%	58%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	67%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	52%	53%	51%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	51%	63%	62%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	58%	62%	71%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	49%	51%	62%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	47%	53%	51%	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	41%	44%	-3%	58%	-17%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	49%	0%	58%	-9%
	2018	47%	43%	4%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	54%	45%	9%	56%	-2%
	2018	49%	46%	3%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	49%	1%	62%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	48%	4%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	54%	8%	64%	-2%
	2018	65%	47%	18%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	54%	45%	9%	60%	-6%
	2018	51%	50%	1%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	44%	12%	53%	3%
	2018	50%	49%	1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	18	51	46	26	36	14	22				
ELL	41	82		59	45						
BLK	29	59	60	41	57	41	15				
HSP	40	78		45	33		50				
MUL	50	64		59	71						
WHT	52	57	39	60	56	18	62				
FRL	35	52	50	41	49	34	30				
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	22	25	24	34	31	17				
ELL	25			42							
BLK	27	36	29	35	45	40	20				
HSP	43	45		37	28		48				
MUL	52	46		62	62						
WHT	51	50	50	63	57	32	55				
FRL	37	42	33	45	47	42	36				

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	20	58	50	25	59	50	19				
ELL	55	69		60	62						
BLK	36	62	46	41	60	53	41				
HSP	50	56		51	64		41				
MUL	73			79							
WHT	66	72	55	69	75	67	55				
FRL	43	65	55	51	67	58	40				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	61
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	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
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 lowest component when factoring school grades was math learning gains in the bottom quartile. Specifically, our fifth grade math scores decreased for all students as compared to the previous year. This is because there was a lack of standard mastery and student remediation of previous skills.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year is our math learning gains from our bottom quartile of students. This is because there was a lack of standard mastery and student remediation of previous skills.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap when compared to the state average is again, our math learning gains for our bottom quartile of students. This is because there was a lack of standard mastery and student remediation of previous skills.

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

The data component showing the most improvement is our ELA learning gains. This is because we had a school-wide focus on literacy and standards focused instruction. Professional development was built around best practices in literacy and teaching reading standards.

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

Looking at the Early Warning Data, an area of concern would be the number of students in third and fourth grade with course failures. This data reflects a need for remediation and intervention to close the gap so students can master current grade level standards.

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

1. Raise math learning gains in our bottom quartile
2. Raise ELA proficiency in all grade levels
3. Maintaining and raising learning gains in ELA and math
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

A need to improve instructional practice relating to Small Group Instruction in Math was identified during school's administrators' debriefing of walkthroughs, informal and formal observations. It was evident that teachers were in need of additional support when trying to successfully collect and analyze student data; develop standards based lesson planning; differentiate instruction with manipulatives; and design quick, and appropriate formative assessments. MWE is particularly focused on closing the achievement gap of our bottom quartile which includes our students with disabilities subgroup as indicated on the 2018-2019 Math FSA.

Measurable Outcome:

If we provide teachers with supported collaboration opportunities focusing on data collection and analysis, standards based lesson planning, differentiated instruction with manipulatives, and design of formative assessments, then math learning gains will increase from 31%-40% in 5th grade as indicated on the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence based strategy being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome of increasing Math learning gains of our bottom quartile is the offering of professional development opportunities to teachers targeting the successful implementation of small group differentiated instruction with manipulatives. If students receive instruction based on rigor, relevance, relationships, and recovery, then learning gains for the bottom quartile with students with disabilities will increase because gaps will close. 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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Small group instruction is where teachers are able to differentiate learning for students. Standards can be remediated based on individual need. Small group instruction is also where teachers can do formative assessments to determine if current standards are being mastered or if intervention is needed. Math manipulatives can be used to support both intervention and remediation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development on teaching math in small groups
2. Provide collaboration opportunities for teachers to discuss best practices and next standard to address during instruction.
3. Provide collaboration opportunities for teachers to review data to drive instruction centered around number talks and small group instruction, (remediation/acceleration). practices and next standard to address during instruction.
4. Training on designing quick, appropriate, formative assessments
5. Ensure that Math manipulatives are available for all teachers to use in the classroom
6. Classroom observation to determine fidelity and follow through

Person Responsible

Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

A need to improve Literacy of ALL students 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 across all academic subjects. This ultimately prevented them from comprehending the content of other subject areas which ultimately impacted student proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science.

Measurable Outcome:

If we provide teachers with professional development focusing on how to integrate literacy across content areas, active learning, student collaboration, and immediate feedback then proficiency will increase in ELA from 46% to 49%, in Math from 55%-58% and in Science from 53%-56% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment and the FCAT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

MWE will utilize Number Talks (Math), Kagan structures, opinion based writing, and collaborative groupings to achieve the intended goal of literacy integration and the measurable outcome of an increase in learner achievement. Administration will utilize classroom observation to ensure fidelity of the implementation, provide timely feedback and follow through to determine next steps.

I. Number Talks instruction will empower students in three ways:

- think flexibly with numbers
- break down numbers to make problems easier
- Use and refine strategies such as adding up in chunks

In order to implement the strategy, teachers will:

- Present an expression or problem for students to solve mentally.
 - Allow adequate "wait time" for most students to come up with an answer. Students can signal with a thumbs up when they have solved the expression.
 - Initially, invite students to share their answers only, not their solutions.
 - Then ask for student volunteers to share how they solved the problem.
 - For each student who shares their solution strategy, chart their thinking on the board.
- Make sure to accurately record their thinking; do not shape or correct their response.
- Have several students who used different strategies share their thinking with the class.
 - Invite students to question each other about their strategies, compare and contrast the strategies, and ask for clarification about strategies that are confusing

Evidence-based Strategy:

Ultimately, Number Talks provide a short and structured way for students to think, ask their peers questions, and explain their own thinking.

II. Kagan structures and collaborative groupings:

Kagan's model of cooperative learning is research based (Hattie, 2009) and provides a structured approach to cooperative learning:

- It helps develop children's social skills such as turn talking, listening to others and sharing information.
- It helps increase learners time on task.
- Kagan structures are content free, allowing teachers to incorporate them into all content areas and grade levels.

In addition, Kagan structures can be integrated into a well-balanced Literacy plan ensuring

the following:

- An increase in learners engagement by utilizing groups of four. This ensures that all learners are participating in the lesson at all times.
- The mastery of skills,
- The narrowing of achievement gap

The following are examples of Kagan program's elements in the areas of reading and writing:

Reading:

- Read aloud
- Shared reading
- Guided reading
- Independent reading
- Word study: phonemic awareness, vocabulary, phonics

Writing:

- Interactive writing
- Guided writing
- Independent writing
- Word study: conventions

Other Literacy connections include:

- Explicit instruction
- Definition of Literacy
- Content and Process standards

III. Opinion Based Writing:

It is imperative that MWE educates students in the upper grades on how to express their opinions about topics of interest and how to utilize appropriate text structures and vocabulary to support their reasoning. Once they are promoted to 6th grade, students will be expected to create argumentative essays, and include reasons for their opinions and preferences.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Reading, writing, and having content-rich discussions with and among students increases vocabulary, comprehension of content, and the ability to analyze and synthesize information.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide teachers with professional development on Number Talks
2. Provide opportunities to attend classroom modeling of Number Talks
3. Provide teachers with professional development on Kagan structures and collaborative groupings
4. Provide teachers with professional development on Opinion Based writing
5. Provide collaboration opportunities for teachers to discuss best practices and next standard to address during instruction while aligning it to the aforementioned PD opportunities
6. Classroom observation to determine fidelity of implementation
7. Follow through by instructional coaches and administrators to provide teacher feedback after walk-throughs/observations and determine next steps

**Person
Responsible**

Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A need to provide capacity building opportunities centered around FSA assessments and FL standards was identified through the 2019-2020 Parent and family engagement event surveys. Parents expressed concern and interest in attending activities that will help them understand how to help their children succeed at school. MWE believes that when parents are engaged in their children's' education, students have better attendance, learn to read faster, and perform better on statewide assessments. MWE is committed to provide more specific trainings on how to manage ESE behavior; and alternative assessments offerings among others.

Measurable Outcome: If parents are engaged through a variety of school events including information about academics and how to help their child succeed, then learning gains will increase from 60% to 63% in ELA and 55% to 58% in math as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategy being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome of building the capacity of MWE's parents is:

- offering of parent engagement events through different platforms (virtual when face to face is not possible) and times (morning, afternoon)
- offer a welcome back virtual school meeting to share with families what we are doing to welcome their students back to the school building safely, as well as what educational opportunities are we offering through the virtual platform.
- offer informational sessions about the curriculum used and standards taught by grade level
- showcase student work and how it aligns with the Florida Standards

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If events are panned at various times throughout the year focusing on both student work and standards being taught, parents will become familiar with what their children are learning in school and how to support their learning at home.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administer a school generated parent survey to determine parents' needs and wants
2. Offer various events throughout the year to encourage family engagement in education
3. Conduct follow up surveys to determine success of events and future planning

Person Responsible Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@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.

The leadership team will continue to monitor the progress of areas of focus and share feedback on these areas during weekly leadership meetings. Additionally, other school-wide initiatives and professional development focuses will be led by instructional coaches and assistant principals.

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.

As the instructional leader of the school, I seek input from all stakeholders when it comes to making decisions. Our SAC committee helps guide parent needs, classroom needs, and ideas for spending our budget. The committee also discusses ways to involve the community through events, protect our students by discussing school safety and advises topics for parent nights that can help families.

I also host parent input and questions and answer sessions for parents. This is done via Zoom. Parents can attend a virtual nighttime meeting where they can address school concerns, hear campus updates, and ask questions on an open forum.

Our school campus has a positive culture that you can feel when you visit. Our teachers and paraprofessionals serve on committees and help solve school-wide issues such as dismissal routines and scheduling. They take pride in our school and ownership of our procedures and policies because they help make and implement them.

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: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00