Marion Oaks Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Marion Oaks Elementary School

280 MARION OAKS TRL, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Dreher   Start Date for this Principal: 7/17/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (47%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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

Marion Oaks Elementary School

280 MARION OAKS TRL, Ocala, FL 34473

[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	67%

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.

Marion Oaks Elementary School seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for all students, through developmentally appropriate and ambitious instruction, that allows for individual differences and learning styles. Each student's success is based upon the school, home and community connection to ensure that each child will become a life-long learner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Marion Oaks Elementary School all stakeholders work together to create students who are lifelong learners that feel safe and inspired.

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
Dreher, Lisa	Principal	To provide visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. Some responsibilities include: Prepare and manage the school's budget and allocated resources Effectively interview, select, coach and evaluate personnel. Manage and administer the instructional program so as to ensure all students the opportunity to learn. Provide leadership and direction for the implementation and evaluation of curriculum and instruction at the school consistent with the district's goals and priorities.
	Assistant Principal	To aid the principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school. Responsibilities include: Assist in development and implementation and assessment of the instructional program. Assist in the administration of the testing program. Assist in establishing vision and mission statement.
Soto, Nancy	Assistant Principal	To aid the principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school. Responsibilities include: Assist in development and implementation and assessment of the instructional program. Assist in the administration of the testing program. Assist in establishing vision and mission statement.
Maldonado, Dawn	Reading Coach	The instructional coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of math, science, and literacy utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning. Responsibilities include: Demonstrate knowledge of current trends in specialty areas and professional development. Demonstrate knowledge of the school's program and levels of teacher skills in delivering the program.
McNulty, Jason	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. Responsibilities include: Assist in the development of guidelines for proper student conduct a policies and procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment. Maintain comprehensive files on each student requiring disciplinary actions

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and maintain records for audits. Maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus and at school-related activities and events during work day. Counsel individual students and, when necessary, make appropriate recommendations for testing, guidance, psychological counseling, or community services. Consider recommendations for student placement in alternative education setting to improve student performance. Supervise student activities on the school campus and at school-related events. Work with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success. To work with all stakeholders to create and build a positive school climate and culture.
Griffin, Jennifer	School Counselor	To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.
Loera, Hazel	School Counselor	To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.
Deubel, Christine	Math Coach	The instructional coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of math, science, and literacy utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning. Responsibilities include: Demonstrate knowledge of current trends in specialty areas and professional development. Demonstrate knowledge of the school's program and levels of teacher skills in delivering the program.
Koviack, Karen	Other	The instructional coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of math, science, and literacy utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning. Provides leadership and guidance to teachers and students in the MTSS process. Responsibilities include: Demonstrate knowledge of current trends in specialty areas and professional development. Demonstrate knowledge of the school's program and levels of teacher skills in delivering the program.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/17/2019, Lisa Dreher

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
69

Total number of students enrolled at the school
898

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

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	112	117	147	151	149	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	815
Attendance below 90 percent	41	48	52	53	66	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
One or more suspensions	4	4	4	6	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	7	26	56	24	26	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176
Course failure in Math	11	19	33	28	29	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	7	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	9	26	44	26	33	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192

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	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	128	137	141	157	132	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	843
Attendance below 90 percent	81	68	60	78	60	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398
One or more suspensions	8	29	43	23	25	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
Course failure in ELA	9	16	28	15	2	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Course failure in Math	9	16	28	15	2	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	33	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	32	48	38	38	61	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	275

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	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	128	137	141	157	132	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	843
Attendance below 90 percent	81	68	60	78	60	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398
One or more suspensions	8	29	43	23	25	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
Course failure in ELA	9	16	28	15	2	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Course failure in Math	9	16	28	15	2	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	33	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	32	48	38	38	61	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	275

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	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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				38%	47%	57%	43%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	56%	58%	38%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	53%	26%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	51%	63%	40%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	58%	62%	41%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	49%	51%	22%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	47%	53%	50%	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	42%	44%	-2%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	45%	-10%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	49%	17%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	45%	-8%	60%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	32%	44%	-12%	53%	-21%
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: iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
• Mathematics, Grades 1-5: iReady 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	20 / 19%	21 / 18%	38 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 18%	13 / 15%	25 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	5 / 26%	4 / 21%	7 / 37%
	English Language Learners	3 / 23%	1 / 8%	1 / 8%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19 / 18%	18 / 16%	34 / 30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 14%	11 / 13%	23 / 27%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 16%	3 / 16%	6 / 32%
	English Language Learners	3 / 23%	1 / 8%	1 / 8%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35 / 29%	32 / 25%	48 / 36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22 / 25%	19 / 20%	27 / 29%
	Students With Disabilities	5 / 23%	2 / 8%	4 / 15%
	English Language Learners	3 / 15%	2 / 9%	2 / 10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11 / 9%	7 / 5%	22 / 17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 7%	4 / 4%	16 / 17%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 9%	3 / 12%	4 / 15%
	English Language Learners	3 / 16%	2 / 9%	2 / 10%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40 / 31%	31 / 22%	36 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27 / 30%	22 / 23%	24 / 26%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 13%	4 / 12%	6 / 18%
	English Language Learners	3 / 13%	1 / 4%	1 / 4%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15 / 11%	13 / 9%	28 / 20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 / 13%	9 / 9%	19 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 3%	1 / 3%	4 / 13%
	English Language Learners	1 / 4%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33 / 25%	17 / 13%	33 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20 / 22%	10 / 10%	17 / 18%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 9%	1 / 3%	1 / 3%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17 / 13%	6 / 4%	27 / 19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 10%	2 / 2%	15 / 15%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 3%	1 / 3%	1 / 3%
	English Language Learners	1 / 4%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30 / 25%	20 / 16%	25 / 19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20 / 25%	14 / 16%	16 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 3%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23 / 19%	20 / 16%	29 / 22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 19%	11 / 13%	18 / 21%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 3%	1 / 3%	2 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	2 / 13%	2 / 13%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47 / 41%	37 / 30%	37 / 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29 / 37%	26 / 31%	24 / 31%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 13%	1 / 3%	1 / 3%
	English Language Learners	3 / 20%	1 / 6%	1 / 6%

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	22	24	26	21	16	21	18				
ELL	29	35	18	33	26	15	34				
BLK	35	58		33	16		35				
HSP	36	42	20	39	30	19	32				
MUL	24			24							
WHT	46	46		44	39		40				
FRL	35	43	35	36	32	20	33				
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	39	37	30	55	50	15				
ELL	34	46	39	49	60	58	22				
BLK	26	50	38	45	58	38	27				

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	38	45	42	52	58	54	31				
MUL	47	75		40	33						
WHT	42	56	52	58	64	55	43				
FRL	38	51	44	51	57	45	34				

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	22	37	29	18	32	19	36				
ELL	35	35	26	26	41	29	35				
BLK	26	25	8	32	33	15	36				
HSP	43	44	30	37	42	27	44				
MUL	54			54							
WHT	49	39	27	45	43	23	62				
FRL	42	38	22	39	41	20	46				

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	297
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

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	35
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	33
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	24
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	43
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	35
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?

FSA Achievement levels over three years averaged 40% for ELA and 44% for Math placing our students 13% /12% below the state average in both core content areas.

School Grade Component Data 2018 2019 2021

ELA Achievement 43% 38% 39% Three Year Average 40%
ELA Learning Gains 38% 51% 45% Three Year Average 45%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile 26% 46% 40% Three Year Average 37%

Math Achievement 40% 53% 40% Three Year Average 44%
Math Learning Gains 41% 59% 30% Three Year Average 43%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile 22% 49% 23% Three Year Average 31%

Science Achievement 50% 36% 36% Three Year Average 41%

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

Reading is the area of greatest concern because it impacts all other academic areas; however math shows a significant decrease from 2019 to 2021 in third and fourth grades. Third grade math proficiency dropped from 66% to 30% and fourth grade math proficiency dropped from 54% to 45%.

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

Tier 1 instruction and the use of standard based activities were not fully implemented. Small group instruction lacked consistency in time and duration. During collaboration content area specialists and administration will work closely with teachers to design standard based activities that will be used to enhance small group instruction. Data will be used to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners in all content areas. Professional development will be offered to improve tier 1 instruction.

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

The areas that showed the most improvement was an increase in fourth and fifth grade reading proficiency. Fourth grade proficiency increased by 1% while fifth grade proficiency increased by 5%. Fourth grade increased from 35% to 36% and fifth grade increased from 35% to 40%.

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

Collaboration was increased from one to two times per week. During this time teachers analyzed student data and planned reteaching lessons based on weekly data. Content area specialist and administration facilitated collaborative planning and assisted teachers in preparing lessons that were rigorous and aligned to the standards.

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

Differentiated small group instruction will take place in all grade levels. In grades K-2 systematic phonics instruction will occur daily. During collaboration higher order questions will be planned out for lessons in all content areas. After school tutoring will take place and focus on increasing reading and math proficiency.

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 to provide teachers with ideas and strategies to improve small group instruction. Training will be offered to K-2 teachers on new B.E.S.T standards and the implementation of systematic phonics instruction. Content area specialist will provide teachers with professional development that will be used to accelerate learning in math through student practice and the alignment of activities to the depth and rigor of grade level standards.

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

Marion Oaks Elementary School will continue to focus on improving Tier 1 instruction. Collaborative planning will occur two times per week in which teachers will use student data to drive instruction that will impact student achievement and proficiency in all core subjects. The administrative team will conduct regular walkthroughs to collect and monitor instructional data. Data will be used for targeted discussions with teachers to improve instructional practices. By focusing on systematic phonics instruction in primary grades then student reading proficiency will increase in the years to come.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Upon the review of data for the past three years, that include state assessment data, district assessment data and classroom assessment data it is evident that Marion Oaks Elementary School needs to focus on planning, aligning and delivering rigorous Tier 1 instruction for all content areas specifically ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	Marion Oaks Elementary School will focus on planning, aligning, and delivering rigorous Tier 1 instruction thus learning gains and proficiency in ELA, Math and Science will increase by 3% as measured by the 2022 FSA. Students in kindergarten through second grade will increase reading and math scores by 3% as measured by iReady.
Monitoring:	Weekly classroom walkthroughs will be conducted and data collected, district and state assessment data (such as i-Ready diagnostic and progress monitoring, FSA) will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will utilize well-planned checks for understandings and other formative data to plan and provide small group instruction. Instructional coaches will provide targeted support during collaboration on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment and check for understanding. The administrative team will facilitate regularly scheduled data chats with teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development on student achievement (.51 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies). Marion Oaks Elementary School will offer professional development that will focus on increasing student differentiation through small group instruction. Teachers will also receive professional development on disseminating data to drive and plan for small group instruction. Through collaboration and professional development opportunities teachers will learn how to implement strategies that will provide rigorous Tier 1 instruction, differentiation, and small group instruction. Teachers will plan higher order questions and check for understandings during collaboration two times per week for all content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that if teachers receive sufficient and ongoing professional development to deliver rigorous Tier 1 core instruction then students receiving the instruction will show outcomes that indicates a greater level of proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development will be provided to all instructional and classroom paraprofessionals on reading strategies and small group implementation which will have a direct impact on all content areas. Collaborative planning will take place two times per week in order to plan for tier 1 instruction, differentiation, and small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

Title I funds will be allocated for Content Area Specialists and Intervention Paraprofessionals. These positions will directly impact student achievement in all content areas. Content Area Specialist will provide academic support for teachers through modeling, collaboration, and professional development. Intervention Paraprofessionals will work directly with students during time set aside each day for Multi Tiered Systems of Support.

Person Responsible	Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on state assessment data Students with Disabilities, African American students, and ELL students need additional support in order to increase student proficiency. In order to increase proficiency Marion Oaks Elementary School will focus on increasing student engagement and goal setting in order to increase student proficiency in these subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	Marion Oaks Elementary School will increase student engagement and learning gains therefore proficiency in ELA, Math and Science will increase by 3% as measured by 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Teachers and students will meet regularly to track and measure goals. This will increase student engagement as students take ownership for their progress. During weekly collaboration teachers will identify trends in student data. Administration will monitor student goals and objectives through weekly collaborative discussions with teachers. During classroom walkthroughs administration will engage in student dialogue based on student data folders.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In addition to goal setting and student data trackers, teachers will work collaboratively each week to plan activities that will increase student engagement for all students in all core subjects.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to John Hattie "Visible Learning" students' expectations for and beliefs in themselves has a 1.44 effect size. "Making the learning intentions and success criteria transparent, having high, but appropriate, expectations, and providing feedback at the appropriate levels is critical to building confidence in taking on challenging tasks."

Action Steps to Implement

In addition to providing teachers with opportunities to collaborate and to plan highly engaging activities for students, Marion Oaks Elementary school's Home School Liaison and Content Area Specialists will also work with parents in order to provide parent trainings and events that will increase student engagement at home and at school.

Person Responsible	Nancy Soto (nancy.soto@marion.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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.

Marion Oaks Elementary School works to build a positive school culture environment through many channels. One way is through the implementation of PBIS program in which the school focuses on the Big Three Fundamental of: doing your best, doing what is right, and treating others the way you want to be treated. Students and teachers are recognized throughout the year for modeling the Big Three. Marion Oaks Elementary School also utilizes the Caring School Community program that promotes healthy social and emotional learning. Parent trainings and events promotes a strong relationship between home and school. Parents are also encourage to be involved in the Student Advisory Council each year.

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

Marion Oaks Elementary School values all stakeholders and encourages the participation in programs such as SAC, parent trainings, parent teacher conferences, and family events. Marion Oaks Elementary School also has a business partner that contributes to the overall positive culture.
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 social and psychological environment as well as give strategies that will support academic standards at home and at school.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00