

Marion County Public Schools

College Park Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

College Park Elementary School

1330 SW 33RD AVE, Ocala, FL 34474

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Teresa Forsyth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2021

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 Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: 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	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

College Park Elementary School

1330 SW 33RD AVE, Ocala, FL 34474

[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	83%

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.

Our mission at College Park Elementary School is to inspire students to become successful citizens in their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at College Park Elementary School is to positively impact the future by creating lifelong learners with the community in mind.

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
Forsyth, Teresa	Principal	The principal coordinates administrative oversight and plans all phases of instructional leadership, including educational programs, staff evaluation, office administration, budgetary planning, discipline, professional development, and counseling services. Ensures a productive learning environment through continual collaboration with teachers, students, parents, and community partners.
Black, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the school site principal, assumes responsibilities in the administration of school curriculum, instructional programs, staff development, guidance and evaluation of staff, state and district testing procedures, and general administrative functions. The assistant principal facilitates grade-level collaboration and team meetings, parent conferences, and campus event planning.
Robles, Noelle	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the school site principal, assumes responsibilities in the administration of school curriculum, instructional programs, staff development, guidance and evaluation of staff, state and district testing procedures, and general administrative functions. The assistant principal facilitates grade-level collaboration and team meetings, parent conferences, and campus event planning.
Barton, Rebecca	Dean	Under the direction of the Principal, the Dean (Student Services Manager) serves as an instructional leader in the planning, coordination, and administration of school activities and behavior incentive programs, including student conduct, attendance, and the social-emotional behavior support program.
Laiz, Noemi	School Counselor	Provides a comprehensive school counseling program that assists all students in acquiring the skills and knowledge to maximize the highest student achievement in a safe learning environment. Confers with classroom teachers, administration, support staff, community agencies, and parents regarding students and their needs. Provides support to teachers in the delivery of the social-emotional support program and related curriculum. Coordinates with school and community agencies to broaden students' resources to support their mental and physical health.
Durrance, Ashley	Reading Coach	The Reading Instructional Coach will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective literacy instruction. In order to fulfill these expectations, the Instructional Coach will provide personalized support that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers in support of the school improvement action plan.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Davis, Chris	Other	The Math and Science Instructional Coach will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective mathematics and science instruction. In order to fulfill these expectations, the Instructional Coach will provide personalized support that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers in support of the school improvement action plan.
Masters, Bryan	Parent Engagement Liaison	The School-Home liaison will work to establish partnerships between parents and schools. He will maintain open and consistent contact with parents and help to organize events, so parents can feel welcome in the school. He will form relationships with parents, so the process of furthering a child's education can become a collaboration between the student and his teachers and parents.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/15/2021, Teresa Forsyth

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

820

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

13

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

13

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	113	122	134	113	135	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	60	43	58	33	59	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
One or more suspensions	16	3	11	7	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	25	38	48	41	45	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226
Course failure in Math	28	32	46	49	46	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	24	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	11	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	30	36	51	42	54	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	261

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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

Thursday 7/15/2021

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	53	117	129	117	132	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	10	7	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	1	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	16	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	23	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	61	38	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	53	40	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163

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	8	11	14	14	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	53	117	129	117	132	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	10	7	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	1	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	16	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	23	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	61	38	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	53	40	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163

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	8	11	14	14	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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				36%	47%	57%	34%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	56%	58%	44%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	52%	53%	41%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				43%	51%	63%	39%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	58%	62%	32%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	49%	51%	25%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				28%	47%	53%	33%	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	28%	44%	-16%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2021					
	2019	24%	45%	-21%	56%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	38%	49%	-11%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	29%	45%	-16%	60%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	23%	44%	-21%	53%	-30%
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	23 / 21%	19 / 16%	36 / 30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20 / 21%	17 / 17%	30 / 29%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 17%	1 / 8%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	5 / 23%	3 / 13%	3 / 12%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12 / 11%	13 / 11%	27 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 11%	12 / 12%	24 / 23%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 17%	2 / 15%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	3 / 14%	2 / 8%	2 / 8%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16 / 13%	19 / 14%	30 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 / 12%	13 / 12%	21 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	1 / 7%	1 / 7%
	English Language Learners	1 / 4%	3 / 11%	3 / 11%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3 / 2%	3 / 2%	13 / 10%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 1%	2 / 2%	10 / 10%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	1 / 7%	1 / 7%
	English Language Learners	1 / 4%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28 / 27%	22 / 20%	33 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 / 27%	14 / 17%	24 / 29%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	1 / 5%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	1 / 4%	1 / 4%	1 / 4%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7 / 7%	10 / 9%	26 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 5%	4 / 5%	18 / 22%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 5%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 4%	1 / 4%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14 / 11%	13 / 10%	12 / 9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 9%	6 / 6%	5 / 5%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 3%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10 / 8%	9 / 7%	24 / 18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 3%	4 / 4%	13 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 3%	3 / 8%	3 / 8%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14 / 14%	4 / 4%	11 / 10%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 8%	2 / 3%	5 / 6%
	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	12 / 12%	4 / 4%	16 / 15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 5%	2 / 3%	10 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 13%
	English Language Learners	1 / 3%	1 / 3%	1 / 3%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35 / 36%	18 / 17%	17 / 16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24 / 34%	12 / 16%	8 / 11%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 4%	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	6	31		20	57	70					
ELL	34	58	100	48	63	82	21				
BLK	38	61		43	36		17				
HSP	42	54	76	52	63	73	33				
MUL	18			36							
WHT	43	53		55	67		33				
FRL	37	53	65	45	54	61	24				
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	16	34	45	23	34	29	4				
ELL	31	52	50	44	56	42	18				
BLK	23	41	72	30	41	44	21				

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
HSP	40	51	48	47	49	31	29				
MUL	45			18							
WHT	38	55		51	57		37				
FRL	32	48	59	39	49	35	22				
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	17	33	33	27	29	18	20				
ELL	24	41	45	37	27	20	10				
BLK	27	47	31	29	26	28	26				
HSP	36	40	35	40	34	22	31				
MUL	10			30							
WHT	46	54	70	53	35		43				
FRL	32	43	41	38	31	23	28				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	419
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	39
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	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	27
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
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	49
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 30% proficiency across all grade levels for both ELA and Math. FSA Achievement levels over 3 years averaged 37% for ELA and 43% for Math, placing our students 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 proficiency data demonstrated the largest deficits in proficiency in both rising third and rising fifth graders. This creates an urgency to correct these deficits since both are 2022 state-assessed grade levels. These were also the most critically underperforming. i-Ready diagnostic data reflects proficiency levels below 30% 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?

60% of our student body are from Hispanic households with many demonstrating gaps in content-specific vocabulary acquisition. Both explicit and implicit vocabulary instruction would improve overall English Language Arts achievement. In 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 achievement.

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

Third grade demonstrated a 20% increase in ELA achievement from Spring 2019 and 5th grade an 8% increase in ELA achievement from 2019.

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

During the double MTSS blocks, students transitioned to assigned teachers to receive small group interventions based on performance data. During collaborative planning, teachers worked together to develop standards-based instruction to support the needs of all students.

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

School-wide vocabulary instruction will be implemented as a systematic approach to word awareness and understanding of word roots to increase ELA proficiency. 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 teach new vocabulary both directly and indirectly, with frequent opportunities for students to learn new words in oral and print contexts. Teachers will plan together each week to isolate the vocabulary words and practice the routine that will be presented in the vocabulary lesson for their grade level to ensure the consistent use of instructional strategies and language.

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 in the gradual release model which will scaffold learning from the preview/ introduction of the concept to the grade level depth of the standard.

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

Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home. The CPS will also provide support to teachers in additional resources as they identify both staff and student needs during collaborative planning and through parent surveys and interviews.

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 40% since 2015.

Measurable Outcome:

Only 32% of 4th and 5th-grade students scored 3 or higher on the FSA in 2021. The 3rd-grade students demonstrated higher learning achievement with 48% earning a 3 or higher. If teachers use data from school-based interim assessments to plan for instruction, then our students will maintain the achievement while earning learning gains across all levels in 2022 to raise our overall ELA proficiency on the FSA to 45% for 3rd through 5th grades.

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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Students will participate in 20 minutes per day of explicit, vocabulary-based instruction in grades K-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

According to Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategies, "Students who experienced vocabulary instruction experienced major improvements in reading comprehension and overall reading skills with an effect size of 0.67." Vocabulary will be taught as a systematic approach to word awareness and understanding word roots with multiple exposures necessary for deeper learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Vocabulary instruction will be scheduled into the ELA block for every grade level from K-5. Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure that vocabulary instruction is consistently administered to fidelity.

Person Responsible

Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will plan together each week to isolate the vocabulary words and practice the routine that will be presented in the vocabulary lesson for their grade level to ensure the consistent use of instructional strategies and language.

Person Responsible

Rebecca Black (rebecca.black@marion.k12.fl.us)

Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home which research has demonstrated has an effect size of 0.52. Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home which research has demonstrated has an effect size of 0.52. Resources will include support through an on-campus resources center and expanded learning classroom, family language acquisition classes, and additional literacy resources for family use at home.

Person Responsible Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: 3-5 Math Proficiency has trended below 50% since 2015.

Measurable Outcome:

Only 38% of 4th and 5th-grade students scored 3 or higher on the FSA in 2021. The 3rd-grade students demonstrated higher learning achievement with 58% earning a 3 or higher. If we develop action steps in response to math school-based interim testing data, then we will maintain the achievement while earning learning gains across all levels in 2022 to raise our overall Math proficiency on the FSA to 55% for 3rd through 5th grades.

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 progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Math tasks and learning activities are implemented to the depth of the standard in a gradual release model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "Providing Working Examples" as having an effect size of 0.57. Research shows that this consists of "a problem statement and the appropriate steps to a solution. Typically the three steps include: introductory phase ("I do"), acquisition/training phase ("We do"), test phase /assess learning ("You do"). This reduces cognitive load for students such that they concentrate on the processes that lead to the correct answer and not just providing an answer. Learning is scaffolded in the I Do/We do phases and ultimately students will practice independently at the depth of the grade-level standard.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan collaboratively to structure the math lessons each week in the gradual release model with the student tasks developed to the depth of the rigor of the standard.

Person Responsible

Noelle Robles (noelle.robles@marion.k12.fl.us)

Student tasks and practice activities will be created and delivered to the depth of the standard. Classrooms will be monitored to ensure the fidelity of the student work remains at the level of the standard complexity. Students will be provided exemplars to increase their understanding of particular skills and to establish standard and benchmark expectations.

Person Responsible

Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home which research has demonstrated has an effect size of 0.52. Resources will include support through an on-campus resources center and

expanded learning classroom, family language acquisition classes, and additional hands-on mathematic resources for family use at home.

Person Responsible Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@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.

School staff, families, volunteers, and our Community Partnership School work together to promote a safe environment and positive school culture. School staff will promote a positive learning environment with the implementation of the Caring School Community SEL program and the continuation of our PBIS program. A committee of school staff volunteers, parents, and community workers will contribute to our multicultural events in October and February celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month and Black History Month. The school administrative team along with a committee of staff volunteers promotes a positive culture by recognizing school staff throughout the year as well as promoting themed days for both staff and students to celebrate learning in a safe environment. The administrative team, teachers, and paraprofessionals will plan and implement parent night events that will build the capacity of caregivers and students to promote a healthy socio-psychological environment and increase intellectual stimulation in the home.

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

The Community Partnership School, which includes the key stakeholders United Way of Marion County, Ocala Health, The College of Central Florida, and Marion County Public Education Foundation, leverages social and instructional capital to offer resources and services to the school. They work to improve students' well-being and success by engaging and supporting parents and the community. Their support includes school readiness, student academic success; physical, social, and emotional health, and parent and school

engagement. Our community business partner, Meadowbrook Church, also makes both monetary and basic supply contributions, as well as providing mentors to work with struggling students. The goal of all of these stakeholders is to work with school staff to remove barriers to learning and provide built-in support so students can achieve academic success and a safe space for participants to study, learn, live, connect, and thrive.

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