

Marion County Public Schools

Mcintosh Area School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

McIntosh Area School

20400 10TH ST, McIntosh, FL 32664

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: David Friedlander

Start Date for this Principal: 10/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	92%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: A (66%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

McIntosh Area School

20400 10TH ST, McIntosh, FL 32664

[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 KG-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	Yes	17%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

McIntosh Area Charter School is committed to providing a challenging, high-quality, first class, education for our students. We strive to fulfill the needs of the whole child by delivering creative lessons designed to inspire dreamers and doers. Our goal is to ensure all students put their knowledge into practical practices, foster a thirst for knowledge, and instill lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

McIntosh Area Charter School's vision is to provide a safe learning environment where students feel comfortable taking academic risks.

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
Friedlander, David	Principal	(1) Manage and administer the instructional program so as to ensure all students have the opportunity to learn. (2) Provide leadership and direction for the implementation and evaluation of curriculum and instruction at the assigned school consistent with the District's goals and priorities. (3) Use current research, performance data, and feedback from students, teachers, parents, and the community to make decisions related to the improvement of instruction and student performance. (4) Oversee the administration of the testing program for the school. (5) Oversee the selection and acquisition of instructional materials and equipment. (6) Facilitate, coordinate, and monitor the implementation of Exceptional Student Education programs and services.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 10/28/2020, David Friedlander

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

Total number of students enrolled at the school

63

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

3

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

3

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	10	13	9	8	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	9	6	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	5	6	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in Math	4	6	3	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	4	7	2	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

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	6	14	10	8	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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	

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	6	14	10	8	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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	

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				43%	47%	57%	35%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				71%	56%	58%	39%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	53%		37%	48%
Math Achievement				41%	51%	63%	35%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	58%	62%	30%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					49%	51%		35%	47%
Science Achievement				31%	47%	53%	64%	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	27%	44%	-17%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	49%	-49%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	54%	-54%	64%	-64%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	45%	1%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	36%	44%	-8%	53%	-17%
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				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/16%	1/8%	2/16%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/8%	0/0%	3/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0%	0/0%	3/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0%	1/10%	2/20%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/25%	2/50%	2/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0%	1/25%	3/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0%	1/11%	1/11%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0%	2/22%	1/11%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3 / 75%	2 / 40%	1 / 20%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	1 / 50%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners			

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
WHT	62			42							
FRL	40			40							
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
WHT	42	72		48	63		27				
FRL	33	73		33	57						
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
WHT	36	35		36	24						
FRL	33	40		33	30						

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	92
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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 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	52
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Students continued to show evidence of low performance in the areas of both reading and math. One factor that has impacted student performance is students completing online learning as opposed to face to face instruction. Additionally, student attendance was a factor that impacted performance.

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

Although we did not have FSA data for the 19-20 school year, students continued to show evidence of low performance in the areas of both reading and math during the 2020-2021 school year.

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

Unfinished instruction and inconsistent student attendance due to implementing Covid-19 protocols is a major factor that contributed to the academic decline. We have increased the hygiene and cleaning procedures throughout our classrooms to minimize the risk of covid 19 exposure and maintain a sanitary learning environment.

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

Based on the 2019 FSA report and progress monitoring, our highest gain was in ELA

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

During the 2nd semester of the 2020-2021 school year, we initiated an afterschool tutoring program to address specific learning needs with students identified through data analysis. For the coming school year, we will be implementing the My View Literacy program within all grades to ensure consistency and continuity with the MCPS.

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

Teachers will incorporate technology into their lessons that allow students to learn using different modalities. Strategies shall include individual and small group instruction, independent learning through computer remediation software, and the use of SIPP and I-ready. We will also try to promote and support additional family involvement at home with the child.

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.

Our teachers will participate with online professional development through Marion County Public schools as well as specific I-ready workshops. Our school calendar mirrors MCPS in order for our staff to participate in live/virtual professional training opportunities

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

We will continue to provide afterschool tutoring services as well as working with our families to provide support to their children at home. We will continue to incorporate the SIPP program during the school schedule as well as utilize the MTSS program to sustain improvement and maintain future academic growth

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: These areas have been identified through the latest FSA spring results obtained. We have hired several new teachers that will need to learn the B.E.S.T standards and be able to implement best practices within their classrooms to meet their student's needs.

Measurable Outcome: Student data will show an increase of at least 30% on the second i-Ready diagnostic assessment in the areas of reading and math.

Monitoring: The above mentioned Area of Focus will be monitored through daily classroom observation, daily student work and performance, I-ready performance, and QSMA quarterly data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: David Friedlander (david.friedlander@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will participate in ongoing data meetings to discuss success and areas for improvement. Teachers will provide remediation that is directly aligned to the curriculum, and this will be evidenced in their lesson plans as well as through walkthroughs/ classroom visits.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected because it will ensure that teachers are continuously monitoring data and tweaking instruction to meet the needs of all learners, providing students the highest opportunity for success.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development Training on data collection strategies will be provided during pre-planning and throughout the year. Instructional staff will be engaged in collaborative learning opportunities to review school wide data and to develop appropriate remediation strategies that address academic deficits and gaps

Person Responsible: David Friedlander (david.friedlander@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our 2021 ELA progress monitoring data show the following percent of grades K-2 students not on track to secure a level 3 are: 100% of Kindergarten, 92% of 1st grade, 81% of 2nd grade. Our 2021 ELA FSA data show the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3: 25% of 3rd grade, 80% of 4th grade, 50% of 5th grade.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2021 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement, 0% of our kindergarten students were proficient, 8% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 18% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. On the 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement 25% of kindergarten, 25% of 1st grade, and 32% of 2nd grade students will be proficient. On the 2021 ELA FSA, 75% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 20% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 50% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA, 85% of 3rd grade, 45% of 4th grade, and 75% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher. In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:

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
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: David Friedlander (david.friedlander@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Scaffolding: Teachers build support for students in learning and gradually take away supports as needed. Teachers model, offer feedback and coaching as students are learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "scaffolding has a 0.82 effect size". Typically, the four steps include: I do, We do, You do together, and then You do alone. This scaffolds the learning process and supports students through guided practice.

Action Steps to Implement

K-5 teachers will collaborate each week to plan phonics and vocabulary instruction and use of scaffolding reading strategies within the ELA block. Teachers should show evidence of scaffolding at the beginning of a learning task and as needed when students need support. Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure that ELA instruction is consistently administered with fidelity.

Person Responsible: David Friedlander (david.friedlander@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Based on the data provided, we will continue to monitor visitor access to the school to ensure the overall safety of students and staff. We will also be incorporating the Raptor alert system into our front office policies to address all visitors. We will continue to review student records to ensure that the needs of all students are being addressed. We will also continue to utilize the MCPS counseling resources available to our students to minimize behavior and discipline concerns

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.

Communication through monthly newsletters will be delivered to parents, staff, and stakeholders through social media. Additionally, our website has been revised to better share information about our school with stakeholders and all our families, staff, and board members have access to school communication through the REMIND app. Board meetings are also a source of two-way communication for stakeholders and are open to the public. At the present time, school events such as Open Houses, are permitted and being planned for the 21-22 school year; though we are also prepared to conduct virtual open houses and parent meetings should the need arise. Such events for stakeholder participation will include online opportunities through Google Meets, Zoom, and Facebook. The School also reaches out to area businesses and community organizations to establish collaborative relationships and completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site under the Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link.

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

The McIntosh School Board plays an integral role in the overall governance of the school and works collaboratively with the school principal in making certain the school complies with all federal, state, and county regulations. The Board also works in conjunction with the principal to ensure the school incorporates fiscally sound and compliant business practices to maintain financial stability. Our Parents are another key stakeholder essential to the academic and cultural success of the school. Their involvement provides the necessary link between the home and the school and reinforces our children's social, emotional, and academic growth. Our staff are essential to establishing a nurturing, supportive, and safe learning

environment and must set the climate of the school. The students are also key and vital stakeholders since they are our future generations and must be prepared to become our future leaders.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00