Ward Highlands Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ward Highlands Elementary School

537 SE 36TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Treasa Buck

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2019

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)	98%
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: B (60%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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

Ward Highlands Elementary School

537 SE 36TH AVE, 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	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

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

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.

Ward-Highlands Elementary School seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success through developmentally appropriate instruction that allows for individual differences and learning styles. Our school promotes a safe, orderly, caring, and supportive environment. Each student's self-esteem is fostered by positive relationships with students and staff. We strive to have our parents, teachers, and community members actively involved in our students' learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ward-Highlands Elementary School is a place where all students can learn; academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere. Teachers and staff work tirelessly to promote a positive school envrionment and raise student preformance. Our goal is to work in a partnership with our parents and community to create an environment where students are empowered to discover their strengths and to achieve their maximum potential. Our entire school community shares the belief that all children can and will learn.

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
Altobello, Kristin	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.
Woelfel, Kelly	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.
Buck, Treasa	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.
Smiley, Carmen	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.
Jones, Tim	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.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Walden, Jessica	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling.She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Cook, Tracy	Dean	The Student Services Manager 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

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/20/2019, Treasa Buck

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.*
6

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
42

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)	98%
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: B (60%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	118	137	127	136	154	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	1	30	20	25	27	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	8	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	1	8	10	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	1	6	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	18	20	35	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/20/2020

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	129	129	130	175	122	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	832
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	13	24	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	11	4	19	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	13	34	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	59	39	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156

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	2	15	16	49	26	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	129	129	130	175	122	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	832
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	13	24	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	11	4	19	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	13	34	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	59	39	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156

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	2	15	16	49	26	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	55%	47%	57%	61%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	56%	58%	63%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	52%	53%	56%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	51%	63%	69%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	58%	62%	78%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	49%	51%	60%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	47%	53%	72%	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	55%	46%	9%	57%	-2%	
Same Grade Comparison		-14%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	62%	49%	13%	58%	4%	
	2018	52%	43%	9%	56%	-4%	
Same Grade Comparison		10%					
Cohort Comparison		7%					
05	2019	57%	45%	12%	56%	1%	
	2018	52%	46%	6%	55%	-3%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison		5%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	44%	49%	-5%	62%	-18%	
	2018	53%	48%	5%	62%	-9%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	63%	54%	9%	64%	-1%	
	2018	59%	47%	12%	62%	-3%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison		10%					
05	2019	61%	45%	16%	60%	1%	
	2018	69%	50%	19%	61%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison		-8%					
Cohort Comparison		2%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	51%	44%	7%	53%	-2%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	59%	49%	10%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	15	48	53	32	61	74	21				
ELL	56	86		61	79						
BLK	25	60	54	38	67	69	17				
HSP	50	71		54	64		40				
MUL	62	72		46	67		100				
WHT	61	65	58	65	67	58	57				
FRL	44	59	53	53	63	63	41				

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	19	35	39	41	52	48	30				
ELL	38			46							
BLK	25	49	67	36	57	48	26				
HSP	53	52		58	42		79				
MUL	64	50		55	50						
WHT	59	47	41	67	57	47	67				
FRL	47	48	45	54	53	37	51				

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	27	47	50	51	61	50	64				
ELL	50	82		50	67						
BLK	31	36	40	53	70	59	36				
HSP	64	77	73	60	67	67	61				
MUL	61	42		83	75						
WHT	67	68	61	73	82	59	84				
FRL	49	56	55	63	74	60	58				

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)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	67
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	47
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	55
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	69
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	62
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	54
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 students in 3rd grade performed below the district and the state average.
Throughout the school year we worked with supporting our students with needs
identified on their IEP along with students not yet identified with specific needs through
the IEP process. There was a high percentage of students identified as ESE in 3rd grade.

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

The greatest decline was in 3rd grade ELA proficiency. Throughout the school year we
worked with supporting our students with needs identified on their IEP along with
students not yet identified with specific needs through the IEP process. There was a high
percentage of students identified as ESE in 3rd grade.

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

Our 3rd grade fell below the district in ELA and Math. For ELA in 3rd grade we were 17% below the state and in Math we were 18% below the state. Throughout the school year we worked with supporting our students with needs identified on their IEP along with students not yet identified with specific needs through the IEP process. There was a high percentage of students identified as ESE in 3rd grade.

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

Our students in 4th grade improved 10% in math compared to how they scored in 3rd on the Math FSA. ELA was not far from that improvement as well with our 4th grade students. Tier 1 instruction in 4th grade is all standards and needs based. Data from 3rd grade was used to guide instruction at the beginning the year and then iReady growth monitoring, diagnostics, and QSMA data was used the remainder of the year. Our ELA and Math CAS played a positive role during collaborative planning and modeling in the classrooms.

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

We have two areas of concern with our students. Attendance in grades KG-5th with students missing more than 10 days of school. The second concern are suspensions in grades 2nd-5th grades.

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

1. Increase learning gains with our 3rd grade retained students
2. Alternative consequences for students in 3rd, 4th, 5th
3. Decrease the percentage of students missing 10 or more days of school
4. Increase proficiency in ELA and Math with our lowest 25%
5. Increase learning gains with our student's with disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Showing growth in the number of points earned with learning gains on FSA in ELA and Math is an indication that students improved more than one year's worth of growth.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide teachers with supported collaboration opportunities focusing on data collected from FSA ELA and Math, iReady growth monitoring and diagnostics, QSMAs, and DRA then we will increase the percentage of points earned with learning gains in the area of ELA from 65% to 68% and in the area of Math from 67% to 70% as indicated on the FSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tim Jones (timothy.jones1@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers, administration, and content area specialists will collaborate to monitor student data, use results to develop individualized instruction and pull resources to assist students in reaching their learning targets. Teachers and content area specialists will implement the action plan developed during collaborative planning with fidelity using the resources and strategies identified based on data
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers are routinely looking at data on individual students and adjusting their instruction to meet the current needs of their students utilizing the evidence based resources identified by the school then we will see an increase in our students growth based on data. 1. iReady online instruction, growth monitoring data, and diagnostic data 2. ELA and Math interventions identified by the district based on individual student data collected from FSA, iReady, DRA, and QSMAs 3. Weekly collaborative planning sessions with teachers and content area specialists utilizing data and standards 4. Biweekly paraprofessional trainings based on data and student need on effective instructional strategies and district approved interventions for ELA and Math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data from multiple sources will be dissected to create an area of focus for the grade level, individual classroom, and individual student.
2. Training will occur with teachers and paras on evidence based strategies, interventions, and instructional
resources needed based on data.
3. Monitoring of student growth through iReady monthly growth monitoring, iReady diagnostic 1 and 2, and
quarterly QSMA/standards check data.
4. Grade level/subject area collaborative planning sessions will take place weekly to evaluate the plan, adjust
instruction and resources based on the current student data.
5. The leadership team will meet weekly to discuss academic growth per grade level, teacher, and reporting
categories for FSA and ESSA.
6. The leadership team will monitor attendance and behaviors of students with 2 or more EWS indicators.

Person Responsible   Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing the reading and writing proficiency of our students will allow students the tools needed to be successful in all academic areas including reading, math, writing, science, social studies, technology and the arts. Students who have a solid foundation in phonics will have a stronger ability to increase their proficiency in reading. When students are provided with instruction on their level they are move motivated to attend school which will increase our daily rate of attendance
Measurable Outcome:	If we integrate literacy across content areas with differentiated instruction then we will increase the percentage of students proficient in reading from 55% to 62% according to the end of year FSA and in writing from 54 to 62 according to the FSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will utilize CKLA phonics program in grades KG-3rd grade. Training will occur with teachers and paraprofessionals on effective phonics instruction. Phonics interventions approved by the school district will be implemented in grades 3rd-5th based on phonics data collected from iReady diagnostic and growth monitoring. iReady online instruction in phonics will be provided to each student exhibiting a need on the iReady diagnostic. The school will utilize Top Score Writing in grades 3rd-5th grades. CKLA writing, vocabulary, and reading instruction will be utilized in grades KG-5th. iReady vocabulary instruction will be used in KG-5th grade for students who have mastered phonics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The phonics instruction provided using CKLA will align with the tier 1 reading instruction provided for our students as well the specific phonics needs based on grade level instruction. iReady online instruction will identify and provided instruction based on student need. iReady will adjust the level of instruction based on the performance of the student. Increasing vocabulary and strengthening reading skills in our students will increase proficiency in text based writing.

Action Steps to Implement

Reading
1. The iReady diagnostic 1 will be provided to all of our students in grades KG-5.
2. Training will be provided for our teachers in utilizing the iReady data.
3. Training will be provided to teachers and paras in CKLA phonics implementation.
4. The leadership team and teachers will monitor phonics data monthly and adjust instruction based on student need.
5. Weekly ELA collaborative planning will take place between grade level teachers, content area specialists, and administration looking at data and available resources.
Writing
1. Training provided by the ELA CAS on Top Score Writing for our 3rd-5th gradeteachers.
2. Training provided by the content area specialist on CKLA writing strategies in KG-5th grades.
3. Data meeting held at the beginning of they year to identify the area of focus in writing by grade level.
4. Training for teachers in KG-5th on the FSA writing rubric and scale.
5. Data meetings held with teachers, content area specialist, and administration after each district writing assessment.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Providing a school-wide focus on expectations and career planning will provide students with a structured learning environment across the campus. We will increase desired behaviors and attendance through positive reinforcement and building an intrinsic motivation to be successful as a member of society.
Measurable Outcome:	If the school provides a focus on the 5 soft skills (teamwork, positive work ethic, communication, positive attitude, dependability and reliability) then discipline referrals will decrease from 424 to 375 and our attendance rate will increase from a daily rate of 94% to 96%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Cook (tracy.cook@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The teachers and staff will focus on the same 5 soft skills as indicated above when developing expectations and classroom management plans. The leadership team will develop expectation in areas across campus outside of the classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The 5 soft skills were developed based on the basic expectations of employers. The skills can be applied across all areas of school, home, and the community. Our teachers were already teaching students these skills just not using the same language. Providing our school with a universal language that can be implemented across all disciplines.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Slow roll out to teachers in August 2020 with posters and school expectations.
2. Student Pep rally with speakers for all 5 soft skill in September 2020.
3. Quarterly Soft Skill Champions from each homeroom class.
4. KG-2 school wide event with community helpers.
5. 3rd-5th school wide event with career day.

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

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.

Parent/teacher organization meetings are held 7-10 times per school year where families, staff, and the community come together to create and implement an action plan addressing academic and emotional needs of our students. The school will also hold quarterly SAC meetings for families, staff, and the community to learn about the school's vision, mission, goals, and progress throughout the year.
Parents will be invited and encouraged to participate ion Family events such as Family Fun Night, Parent
Conference nights, Publix math nights, Open House, and Reading Nights for parents.
*Quarterly assessments and ongoing iReady data will allow us to monitor student achievement.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00