Reddick Collier Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Reddick Collier Elementary School

4595 W HIGHWAY 316, Reddick, FL 32686

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Donald Manning

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (43%)
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

Reddick Collier Elementary School

4595 W HIGHWAY 316, Reddick, FL 32686

[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	68%

School Grades History

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

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.

Reddick-Collier celebrates the people we are, the work we do, and the difference we make.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reddick-Collier is building a strong foundation for graduation and beyond.

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
Cooper, Melicia	Principal	Day to day management of school site School-home Liaison Facilitator Pre K-5th grade Instructional Leader Student Services Support Team Member Professional Development Facilitator School Safety Coordinator Human Resource Operations Student Achievement Monitor
Allen, Clayton	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making. Assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of the implementation of the intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specified areas.
Krietemeyer, Carol	Reading Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards & B.E.S.T Standards for Language Arts and Writing. Provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods, and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Roberts, Tina	Math Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for math and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods, and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Jackson, Sandra	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor assists school administrators and educators with planning and carrying out school-related programs and events. Her main duties include helping students maintain academic focus, assisting students at risk, identifying individual skills, and tackling emotional problems. In addition, she interprets and conducts an analysis of data; facilitates the development of intervention plans; and provides support for intervention fidelity. She assists with professional development for behavior concerns and assists in facilitating data-based decision-making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wager, Jenny	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) implements the disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. Works closely with families and the teaching staff, the Dean assists in facilitating positive interaction with the learning environment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Donald Manning

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

Total number of students enrolled at the school
388

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

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	48	69	59	50	74	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	358
Attendance below 90 percent	21	21	20	19	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	7	6	7	6	22	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA	14	28	25	8	18	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
Course failure in Math	14	20	27	11	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	6	5	1	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	20	23	27	12	29	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	73	64	53	72	64	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	9	39	29	23	32	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	1	4	8	6	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	3	3	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	2	1	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	28	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	9	6	8	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	73	64	53	72	64	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	9	39	29	23	32	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	1	4	8	6	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	3	3	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	2	1	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	28	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	9	6	8	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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				40%	47%	57%	33%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	56%	58%	25%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	52%	53%	16%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				46%	51%	63%	32%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	58%	62%	38%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	49%	51%	19%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	47%	53%	31%	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	45%	44%	1%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	30%	49%	-19%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	45%	1%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	49%	15%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	45%	-11%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	37%	44%	-7%	53%	-16%
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	8 / 13%	13 / 19%	27 / 39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 14%	12 / 21%	22 / 39%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 13%	1 / 11%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11 / 19%	9 / 13%	23 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 18%	7 / 12%	20 / 36%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 13%	1 / 11%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8 / 15%	12 / 20%	18 / 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 15%	8 / 17%	12 / 27%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	3 / 33%	3 / 38%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4 / 7%	2 / 3%	10 / 18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 7%	1 / 2%	7 / 16%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 13%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11 / 24%	6 / 12%	10 / 20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 19%	3 / 9%	7 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 15%	0 / 0%	3 / 21%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2 / 4%	2 / 4%	7 / 16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 3%	1 / 3%	3 / 10%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 18%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11 / 16%	9 / 12%	9 / 13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 14%	8 / 13%	6 / 11%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 5%	2 / 10%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	2 / 22%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5 / 7%	4 / 5%	8 / 13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 5%	3 / 5%	5 / 10%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15 / 27%	7 / 12%	8 / 15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 28%	4 / 10%	2 / 6%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 17%	1 / 17%	1 / 20%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13 / 23%	4 / 7%	19 / 35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 19%	1 / 3%	11 / 31%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 17%	1 / 17%	2 / 40%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25 / 46%	17 / 31%	17 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16 / 46%	7 / 19%	9 / 26%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 40%	1 / 20%	1 / 20%
	English Language Learners	1 / 20%	1 / 20%	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	9	46		15	38	20					
ELL	39			30							
BLK	25	56	70	21	30	25	20				
HSP	37	50		45	64		55				
WHT	67	53		59	59		73				
FRL	34	49	75	33	43	25	44				
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	9	38	38	10	62	62					
ELL	42	73		48	71						
BLK	31	56	42	41	58	57	17				
HSP	39	59		50	59		36				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
WHT	52	56		49	53		55				
FRL	35	54	46	44	56	63	31				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	3	8	6	6	19	13	14				
ELL	16	8		11	23						
BLK	22	22	18	21	35	19	11				
HSP	29	19		26	31		33				
WHT	51	34		50	46		57				
FRL	28	25	17	29	36	18	27				

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	44
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	32
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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	47
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	
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	62
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	41
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 36% for ELA and 38% for Math in both content areas. Looking closely at the data, our scores on ELA proficiency have dropped from 2019 at 40% to 39% in 2021. Math proficiency dropped from 2019 at 46% to 37% in 2021. Placing our students 20% below the state average in both content areas.

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

An analysis of the provided data demonstrates deficits in proficiency for 3-5 graders in both ELA and Math. This creates an urgency to correct these deficits since they are 2022 state assessment grade levels.

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 is not meeting the needs of our learners as evidenced by data of multiple school years. New actions to address ELA and Math proficiency will include collaborative conversations using data analysis and strategy-based direct instruction. Instructional rounds will identify trends and areas of focus.

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

Science showed the most improvement with an 11% increase in proficiency.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement was the use of data to guide Tier 1 instruction and the utilization of hands-on activities. Additionally, science 3rd and 4th-grade foundational skills were explicitly taught and reviewed as needed.

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

Formative assessment data will be utilized to guide instructional decisions and delivery of content school-wide. Direct instruction will be delivered in a systematic way to ensure alignment with grade-level standards.

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 conversations and administrative data chats to facilitate the increase of student proficiency. Teachers will develop skillsets with strategies in response to data results that will include acceleration and differentiation. Teachers will collaboratively plan each week to develop direct instruction to be delivered in a systematic way.

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

Title I events will strengthen the school-to-home partnership by providing families with additional resources and strategies that support standards-based instruction.

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 40% and below since 2017.
Measurable Outcome:	Only 39% of 3-5th grade students scored 3 or higher on the FSA in 2021. 5th-grade students demonstrated higher learning achievement with 51% earning a 3 or higher. If we provide all instructional staff professional learning focusing on scaffolding instruction, teacher clarity, and higher-level questioning, then our overall ELA learning gains and proficiency will increase by 5%.
Monitoring:	Weekly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data (such as iReady diagnostic, iReady progress monitoring, FSA, MTSS data, etc.), will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. 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. The CAS will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and check for understanding.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melicia Cooper (melicia.cooper@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will attend to student mastery of standards using formative assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategies, "Providing formative evaluation to teachers, 0.90" teachers will seek evidence from formative assessments to identify areas for improvement in future instruction. Weekly collaborative planning and data chats will be implemented with a focus on accelerating and differentiating for student mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

Formative assessment data will be analyzed during weekly data chats with the leadership team. Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure instructional delivery is aligned with the data.

Person Responsible	Melicia Cooper (melicia.cooper@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 2016.
Measurable Outcome:	Only 36% of 3-5th grade students scored 3 or higher on the FSA in 2021. 5th-grade students demonstrated higher learning achievement with 56% earning a 3 or higher. If we provide all staff professional learning focused on scaffolding instruction and student engagement strategies, then our overall Math learning gains and proficiency will increase by 5%.
Monitoring:	Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melicia Cooper (melicia.cooper@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use the 7 steps of direct instruction to facilitate standards-based instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "Direct Instruction", as having an effect size of 0.59. The steps include stating learning goals, communicating standards for increased performance, and engaging students through guided and independent practice.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible	Tina Roberts (tina.roberts@marion.k12.fl.us)

Student tasks and practice activities will be identified 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.

Person Responsible	Melicia Cooper (melicia.cooper@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.

The discipline data from the 2020-21 school year provides the primary concern of inappropriate behavior in school. The implementation of positive reinforcement strategies in the classroom and school-wide through PBIS will help lessen the unwanted behaviors, and therefore the number of referrals. Additionally, teachers will utilize the SEL curriculum to help students with their emotional responses.

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.

The implementation of positive reinforcement strategies in the classroom and school-wide through PBIS, and teachers and utilizing the SEL curriculum to help students with their behavioral and emotional responses in school. A small group of school stakeholders (administration, teachers, paras) plan the implementation for PBIS, then all staff members follow through with the positive reinforcement. All teachers will complete the SEL curriculum every day after announcements.

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

Stakeholders include leadership team members, teachers, paraprofessionals, parents, and community members.

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**