Marion County Public Schools

Anthony Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Anthony Elementary School

9501 NE JACKSONVILLE RD, Anthony, FL 32617

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gay Street

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 (45%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

Anthony Elementary School

9501 NE JACKSONVILLE RD, Anthony, FL 32617

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	51%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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.

Anthony Elementary School will accomplish the highest academic achievement possible for our students while creating a safe and nurturing school environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that “all children can learn and succeed.” We will be an exemplary learning community school. We build the foundation of this community through meaningful relationships, relevant and engaging learning, and effective communication.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnson, James	Principal	The Principal is the instructional leader of the school. Their job duties include, but are not limited to accountability, public relations, budgets, evaluations, SAC, facilities, crisis management, Title 1, business partners, scheduling, and professional development.
Hamby, Kendra	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal's main role is to oversee the areas of curriculum and instruction. Some of their job duties and responsibilities include Tier Talks/ PMP meetings, PST meetings, MTSS, testing coordinator, Skyward gradebook, textbooks and curriculum materials, report cards and progress reports, professional development, and evaluations.
Bradshaw, Saundra	School Counselor	The guidance counselor oversees the areas of youth mental health, as well as 504 and ESE staffings. Their duties and responsibilities include counseling students, attendance, social work, DCF liaison, mentoring, needy student programs, character education, and homeless student needs.
Arnold, Veronica	Instructional Coach	The instruction coach (literacy) duties and responsibilities are ELA teacher support, facilitate collaborative planning, reading intervention strategies, PD/ training, and parent nights.
Clark, Kristina	Instructional Coach	The instruction coach (math/science) duties and responsibilities are math/ science teacher support, facilitate collaborative planning, math intervention strategies, PD/training, and parent nights.
Ostanik, Kelly	Dean	The Dean oversees the areas of discipline and behavior, supports teachers with classroom management needs, and oversees the following: fire and ALICE drills, school safety, Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS), behavior MTSS, and PST meetings for behavior.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 1/4/2018, Gay Street

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.*

0

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school
395

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	67	65	61	67	53	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	385
Attendance below 90 percent	27	13	20	21	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	7	3	1	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	4	15	10	17	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in Math	11	13	10	11	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	14	14	13	17	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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
Friday 8/20/2021

2020-21 - 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	34	60	63	65	51	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Attendance below 90 percent	12	36	33	33	28	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	1	5	3	7	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	5	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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

2020-21 - 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	34	60	63	65	51	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Attendance below 90 percent	12	36	33	33	28	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	1	5	3	7	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	5	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	10	0	0	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				41%	47%	57%	37%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	56%	58%	30%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	52%	53%	33%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				40%	51%	63%	34%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				38%	58%	62%	38%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	49%	51%	26%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				49%	47%	53%	42%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	41%	44%	-3%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	32%	49%	-17%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	45%	-6%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	25%	45%	-20%	60%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	47%	44%	3%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:
• English Language Arts, Grades 1-5: I Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
• Mathematics, Grades 1-5: I Ready Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
• Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11 / 19%	8 / 13%	22 / 37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 20%	6 / 13%	16 / 36%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 20%	1 / 20%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5 / 9%	6 / 10%	20 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 9%	5 / 11%	9 / 27%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 20%	2 / 40%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10 / 18%	13 / 22%	20 / 34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 14%	9 / 20%	16 / 35%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1 / 2%	3 / 5%	15 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0 / 0%	2 / 4%	13 / 28%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16 / 27%	8 / 13%	15 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 20%	6 / 13%	8 / 17%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 18%	1 / 8%	1 / 9%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1 / 2%	4 / 6%	11 / 17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 2%	3 / 6%	9 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 10%	0 / 0%	2 / 17%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10 / 20%	5 / 10%	4 / 8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 16%	2 / 5%	3 / 8%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1 / 2%	4 / 8%	9 / 18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 3%	2 / 5%	5 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13 / 20%	6 / 9%	10 / 14%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 20%	6 / 12%	7 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	0 / 0%	1 / 8%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13 / 20%	8 / 12%	17 / 25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 18%	7 / 13%	13 / 25%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	0 / 0%	1 / 8%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	31 / 50%	24 / 35%	24 / 35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 / 44%	16 / 31%	17 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 27%	2 / 15%	2 / 15%
	English Language Learners	1 / 50%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	19		25	7		18				
ELL	15			31							
BLK	26	40		31	44		25				
HSP	37	27		36	29		31				
WHT	43	42		51	41		50				
FRL	32	43		38	45	31	37				

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	12	50	53	17	47	42	23				
ELL	33	43		24	31		40				
BLK	26	51	50	23	31	31	23				
HSP	43	52		32	36		44				
WHT	50	63	45	52	44		68				
FRL	35	53	52	33	39	50	38				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	26	28	7	28	33	17				
ELL	30	44		21	25						
BLK	24	28		24	24		33				
HSP	38	36		29	36		36				
WHT	45	27	20	46	46		50				
FRL	31	30	41	30	38	26	39				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	332
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Student performance using grade-level progress monitoring tools consistently demonstrated student performance below 36% proficiency across all grade levels for both ELA and Math. FSA Achievement levels over 3 years averaged 38% for ELA and 39% for Math, placing our students at least 20% below state averages in both core content areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

An analysis of 2020-2021 i-Ready reading and math proficiency data demonstrated the largest deficits in proficiency in our rising fifth graders. This creates an urgency to correct this as these students affect our 2022 FSA state assessment. I-Ready diagnostic data reflects proficiency levels below 38% across all grade levels from first to fifth.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We found that In both ELA and math, student practice tasks were not consistently aligned with the instructional level of rigor and complexity to meet the demands of the grade-level standard. Providing students with grade-level tasks with scaffolded instruction would improve overall math and ELA achievement.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The most improvement over a 3 year period is seen in overall math achievement: 2018 34%, 2019 40%, and 2021 44%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

A few of the contributing factors to the increase in math achievement include manipulating the master schedule to give the teachers more time for math instruction. We also provided the teachers with several math-related professional learning opportunities such as Structuring the Math Block, planning for math intervention, and math discourse.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

School-wide grade level collaborative planning focused on improving Tier 1 instruction will continue to be improved in all subjects, in order to make it more useful for the teachers. Tier 1 math lessons will be structured in a gradual release model with student learning activities aligned to the depth of the standard in rigor and complexity.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be offered during collaborative planning as teachers develop skillsets with strategies to deliver quality Tier 1 instruction. They will examine common assessments and use that data to drive their next steps. Professional development will also be offered during collaborative planning for strategies to accelerate learning in math through student practice aligned to the depth and rigor of the grade-level standard.
Teachers will plan collaboratively and receive professional development to structure math lessons each week with the math coach.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

This year, with the addition of our 2nd instructional coach, we will be able to better support the teachers with instructional delivery and planning. Also, we plan to use our new "Intervention Teacher" to target specific groups of students for remediation and intervention as data dictates.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	3-5 ELA proficiency has trended below 42% since 2018, with a decrease from 41% to 38% from 2019-2021. Only 34% of 3rd and 4th-grade students scored 3 or higher on the FSA in 2021. These are the students that will make up our learning gains as well.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers use data from school-based common grade-level assessments to plan for instruction, then ELA grades 3-5 proficiency will increase as follows: 3rd from 33% to 36% 4th from 33% to 36% 5th from 39% to 42%
Monitoring:	K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2021, AP2 January 2022, and AP3 May 2022 K-5: i-Ready Growth Monitoring November 2021 and March 2022 3-5: District QSMAs Q1 October 2021, Q2 December 2021, Q3 March 2022 3-5: 2022 FSA ELA Proficiency Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. We will also monitor the effectiveness of implementation using classroom walkthrough observational data and other assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be provided with professional development in student engagement through discourse, student feedback practices, and purposeful ongoing formative assessment. We will follow up on these professional learning opportunities by conducting focused formative walkthroughs with the leadership team to gauge the implementation of these practices. According to John Hattie's research, in his Index of Teaching, teacher use of formative evaluations has a .90 effect size and the highest effects are seen when teachers seek evidence on where exactly students aren't doing well.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through evidence collected in doing classroom walkthroughs, it was found that Tier 1 instruction is inconsistent among grade levels. Therefore, in addition to continuing to improve our collaborative planning process, we are focusing on improving teachers' Tier 1 instruction across all subjects and grade levels. Specifically, we will focus on student engagement through discourse, providing students with quality feedback, and implementation of purposeful formative assessment to drive future instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a professional development plan with the leadership team to emphasize Tier 1 goals. Specifically, we will focus our professional development efforts on giving the teachers the tools to be able to design lessons and instruction that provide opportunities for them to check the students' understanding at the moment, and then make adjustments if needed, based on the data collected.

Person Responsible James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Support teachers with Tier 1 goals during ELA collaborative meetings. During these twice-weekly collaborative meetings, coaches/administrators and teachers will work together to develop the pacing and sequencing of the standards taught each week. The teachers will be provided with a number of vetted, standards-aligned, resources to use to plan each week's learning activities. Coaches will also support the teachers in purposeful planning of embedded formative assessments to systematically monitor the entire

classes' level of mastery of each lesson. This collected data will also be discussed and compared between teachers in each grade level each week at collaborative planning meetings to help guide future instruction.

Person Responsible Veronica Arnold (veronica.arnold@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	3-5 Math Proficiency has trended below 45% since 2018. Only 41% of 3rd and 4th-grade students scored 3 or higher on the FSA in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	If we use math grade-level common assessment data to make daily instruction decisions, then we will increase math proficiency in grades 3-5 as follows: 3rd 39% to 41% 4th 38% to 40% 5th 46% to 48%
Monitoring:	K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2021, AP2 January 2022, and AP3 May 2022 K-5: i-Ready Growth Monitoring November 2021 and March 2022 3-5: District QSMAs Q1 October 2021, Q2 December 2021, Q3 March 2022 3-5: 2022 FSA Math Proficiency Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine the progress of student mastery of the standard and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will provide the teachers Professional Development to learn new strategies and resources to help improve students' computational fluency. We will also provide training for the teachers to help them develop a strategic plan for math intervention to be implemented in their class.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In looking at our math data recently, we have been able to increase our proficiency slightly, but our learning gains (especially for our bottom quartile) have decreased. We believe that one of the biggest factors contributing to this issue is a lack of computational fluency with our non-proficient students. Therefore, we will focus on improving computational fluency through a variety of methods and resources. In addition to these strategies, we will also provide the teachers with a concrete plan for Math intervention to be used daily in their classrooms to also help fill in the gaps. We think that having a more purposeful math intervention time will allow the teacher to be more targeted with their support to those students.

Action Steps to Implement

Support teachers with Tier 1 goals, emphasizing improving computational fluency during math collaborative meetings. During these twice-weekly collaborative meetings, coaches/administrators and teachers will work together to develop the pacing and sequencing of the standards taught each week. The teachers will be provided with a number of vetted, standards-aligned, resources to use to plan each week's learning activities. Coaches will also support the teachers in purposeful planning of embedded formative assessments to systematically monitor the entire classes' level of mastery of each lesson. This collected data will also be discussed and compared between teachers in each grade level each week at collaborative planning meetings to help plan for each teacher's dedicated math intervention time.

Person Responsible	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

We will work with district personnel to develop professional development to support "structuring the intervention block" for math. In addition to the professional development focus on computational fluency

and math intervention, we will also focus our training efforts on other Tier 1 strategies such as math discourse and student feedback practices.

Person Responsible Kendra Hamby (kendra.hamby@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

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.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers, and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:
• A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
• Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
• Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
• Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
• Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
• Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
• Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment, we will offer different modalities (online and paper-based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys, and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The key stakeholders with a role in promoting a positive school culture and environment at the school include the Principal and Leadership Team, the teachers and staff, the parents, and the students. Each one of these groups plays a key role in promoting that positive culture. The Principal and Leadership Team are responsible for creating a culture where positivity is valued, and negativity is not given a chance to grow. They can do this by leading by example. The teachers and staff can also promote that positive culture by ensuring that the culture in their particular classroom or area is positive in nature. It stands to reason that if all of the "mini-cultures" in the school are positive, then the overall culture will be positive as well. Next, the parents can contribute to the overall environment by supporting the personnel at school as they build a positive environment. Finally, the students contribute by following all school expectations and also being good influences on their peers.

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**