Marion County Public Schools

Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School

16705 SE 134TH TER, We IR Sdale, FL 32195

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Brodie

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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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

Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School

16705 SE 134TH TER, We IR Sdale, FL 32195

[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	34%

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.

We are united in challenging students to reach their fullest potential in a safe, positive, caring environment which is conducive to teaching and learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a community school for student-centered learning that provides a family-friendly environment in order to develop successful and well-rounded global leaders.

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
Brodie, Cynthia	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.
Kelly, Tammy	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.
Carson, Georgiana	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.
Byard, 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.
Alderman, Amy	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.
Tucker, Doris	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. In addition work with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Cynthia Brodie

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	87	88	75	97	87	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518
Attendance below 90 percent	50	44	35	41	32	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226
One or more suspensions	9	5	7	8	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	5	8	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	5	8	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	12	17	17	32	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Tuesday 8/11/2020

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	80	86	69	90	80	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	5	22	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	13	10	32	21	16	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	10	13	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	54	27	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	17	17	32	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

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	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	80	86	69	90	80	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	5	22	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	13	10	32	21	16	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	10	13	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	54	27	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	17	17	32	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

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	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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%	47%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	55%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	53%	54%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	46%	51%	63%	54%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	58%	62%	50%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	49%	51%	41%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	47%	53%	48%	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	28%	44%	-16%	58%	-30%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	49%	0%	58%	-9%
	2018	51%	43%	8%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	48%	45%	3%	56%	-8%
	2018	38%	46%	-8%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	35%	49%	-14%	62%	-27%
	2018	49%	48%	1%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	54%	4%	64%	-6%
	2018	49%	47%	2%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	43%	45%	-2%	60%	-17%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	61%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	44%	9%	53%	0%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	23	38	35	30	44	44	44				
ELL	23	38		27	38						
BLK	33	40		33	30						
HSP	43	53		45	49		56				
MUL	60			47							
WHT	42	51	32	47	50	34	49				
FRL	38	53	36	41	45	30	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	16	41	31	29	44	32	15				
ELL	24	64		35	43						
BLK	47	50		53	58						
HSP	40	59		50	46		36				
MUL	38			46							
WHT	43	43	27	47	44	35	45				
FRL	43	44	26	48	45	37	43				
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	24	32	45	37	41	33					
ELL	19	38		31	31						
BLK	50	85		45	54						
HSP	37	55		49	42	20	42				
MUL	46			77							
WHT	49	52	52	54	49	44	47				

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
FRL	45	54	52	52	47	42	43				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	349
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	34
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	47
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	54
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	44
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Two data components show the lowest performance: ELL and SWD at 23% proficiency. Possible factors that had a negative impact are: Lack of utilizing ELL strategies, lack of effectively planning lessons to meet the depth of the standard with differentiation for ELL and SWD students, Fifth Grade

had two inclusion classes with one new teacher to the grade level, new Reading series to learn and implement, and total number of SWD students in fifth grade.

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

Math Achievement showed the greatest decline in the subgroup area of Black students. These students had a higher percentage of Early Warning Signs, behavioral concerns, and BESS Universal Screener showed this subgroup with a higher need.

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.

Lowest 25% for ELA and Math showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The SWD comprise a majority of the Lowest 25% in ELA and Math and have a higher previous retention rate and show minimal growth. ELL students still struggle with language development. Both SWD and ELL had a lack of strategies being utilized and differentiation on the student academic level.

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

Two components showed the most improvement: SWD Science Achievement and Multiracial ELA Achievement. New actions that were put into place that had a positive impact were: collaborative planning for lessons and resources to be utilized; a dedicated 5th grade Science teacher; Early Release school days were science focused; hands on science learning labs and utilizing a STEM Lab for students.

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

EWS data shows two areas of potential concern: Attendance Rate below 90% and Level 1 on state assessment which leads to retention rate increase. Within attendance in grade 3-5th, 52 students were below 90%. Students with Level 1 are potential Bottom Quartile students and will count with Learning Gains

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

1. Effective instruction for Third Grade retained students in the area of Reading and Math.
2. Implementing with fidelity the MTSS process and students placed in correct interventions, closely monitored, and moved among the Tiers as appropriate.
3. Increasing student engagement and hands on learning in all grade levels.
4. Continuing to support and improve Science content learning.
5. School wide classroom management and supporting behavioral expectations.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through classroom observations of student time on task as well as iReady and district assessment data, it is determined that if we focus on increasing student engagement through cooperative learning strategies and differentiation in reading and math through whole group and small group instruction then leaning gains will increase and in return proficiency rates will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	If we utilize cooperative learning strategies to build engaging lessons and increase student engagement, then students in grades 3, 4, and 5 that are in the Lowest 25% for ELA Learning Gains will increase from 38% to 43% and Math will increase from 33 to 40% as measured by the 2020-2021FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of Kagan strategies and cooperative learning strategies and styles to elicit student discussion in the classroom. Kagan provides structured strategies that research shows increases student engagement and voice and enhances learning. This will be monitored through modeling a monthly strategy, walkthrough and fidelity checklist.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie's Effect Size research shows the impact (0.82) of student discussion in the classroom. Kagan strategies is a well known program of procedures for classroom discussion. Utilizing these strategies in all content areas will enhance student learning and student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze individual student data as well as classroom data to determine strengths and weaknesses in student learning outcomes.
2. Determine a list of appropriate and effective cooperative learning methods for teachers to implement during lessons that have a high effect size.
3. Develop lessons utilizing the cooperative learning strategies and differentiated techniques for whole group and small group instruction.
4.Implement the strategies and differentiation techniques.
5. Evaluate the implementation, look at performance data, and determine next steps of instruction.

Person Responsible Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students who are non-proficient have learning gaps. The MTSS process allows teachers to work with students to close the learning gaps if appropriate interventions are implemented and monitored and adjusted per individual student as data determines.
Measurable Outcome:	If we implement the MTSS process and provide interventions with fidelity, the Federal Subgroups (Students with Disabilities 37%, English Language Learners 33%, Black/African American Students 34%, and Economically Disadvantaged Students 40%) will reach the target Federal Index of 41%, as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	MTSS protocol (Stair Step) developed by district utilizing research based programs such as: iReady, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Phonics for Reading, Leveled Literacy, Read Naturally, etc. The programs are monitored through Fidelity Checklists as well as data record keeping by the teacher designed through the program outline.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The district provides a list of approved resources/programs to be utilized and how to determine effectiveness of each program. The district chose research based intervention programs that have strong impact on student achievement. Each school utilizes the choices from the district list that matches the intervention needs of the students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assess students for starting point using iReady Diagnostic Assessment.
2. Look at the data and determine greatest deficiency area and group like students together in a grade level to form MTSS groups.
3. Determine the intervention and interventionist for each MTSS group and create groups.
4. Start MTSS groups and collect data and review data every six weeks for level of effectiveness for each student.
5. Re-assess quarterly using iReady diagnostic assessments.
6. Review the data and adjust groups as necessary.
7. Continue the MTSS process.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students in low socio-economic status sometimes struggle with adapting from home environment to a structured school environment. Outside factors impact our students behavior and choice making. By providing our students with the strategies they can use to problem solve a situation, finding appropriate language to utilize, and appropriate actions to take, students will increase their confidence and social problem solving skills which will then impact discipline referrals and in return impact positively student achievement. The BESS screener is utilized twice a year to target the areas of Social Emotional Learning. This program will impact the outcome of the data collecting resource as well as the every day well being of our students.
Measurable Outcome:	If we implement a school-wide SEL (Social Emotional Learning) curriculum, then students will develop social, emotional skills to help them self-regulate their behavior decreasing the number of discipline referrals by 20% from 2019-2020- 316 referrals to 2020-2021- 253 referrals or less.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Byard (james.byard@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize the district based adopted SEL program - Sanford Harmony through the Social Studies block. According to the program, "Sanford Harmony fosters communication, understanding, connecting, and community... develops students into compassionate and caring adults." Each classroom has a scheduled SEL time in their schedule for instruction and then infuses the strategies throughout the week. Program is monitored through collaborative planning and classroom walkthroughs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Under federal law, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the district has chosen the SEL curriculum for schools to utilize and to incorporate the program through Social Studies teaching block. The program provides strategies and a "tool box" for students to use through social situations through the use of content area curriculum.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Receive the Sanford Harmony curriculum from the district.
2. Deliver the curriculum to the teachers.
3. Train the teachers and staff on Sanford Harmony so all have the strategies.
4. Classroom observations and timely feedback to teachers on implementation in the classroom.
5. Utilize Morning Show to emphasize a school wide greeting weekly through the Sanford Harmony curriculum.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Professional Development for ongoing learning will take place on District Inservice days as well as school based Faculty PD opportunities. Utilization of administration, Content Area Specialists, and district Program Specialists in select areas will provide the professional development. Topics are determined by district data for district professional development days and school based professional development is determined by teacher needs as well as student outcome data that drives instruction.

School Safety: The continuation of utilizing an SRO and implementing ALICE Protocol drills monthly as our campus is an open campus with access for any person at any time. Most doors are locked during the school day however the campus is open. Continuing to work with the district on implementing safe practices for students and school staff.

School wide behavioral management system to continue to decrease student behaviors by fine tuning classroom managements systems as well as school wide. Parent communication is a vital component. Providing teachers and parents with conference times and implementing tracking sheets for students who struggle with behaviors.

Online learning will be addressed throughout the school year with professional development opportunities for staff, students, and parents.

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.

Stanton-Weirsdale Elementary School is a community based school which has partnerships with community groups. The school also has a Business Partner that meets regularly with administration to determine how it may continue to best support the school with resources. The School Advisory Council meets minimum four times a year to address current data, curriculum, and needs of the students, staff, and community and decisions are made through the council. The staff meets minimum once a month in committees to address the various areas of the school campus to determine strengths and needs to be worked on. The school encompasses common language to instill a positive culture on campus as well as a growth mindset in all classrooms. There is a community Care Closet where families can request household support, students can get shoes and clothes, and food when needed to help provide a well-rounded environment for all students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**