

Marion County Public Schools

# Sparr Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Sparr Elementary School

2525 E HWY 329, Anthony, FL 32617

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Renee Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (48%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

## Sparr Elementary School

2525 E HWY 329, Anthony, FL 32617

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

### 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.**

Our mission is to foster relationships with all stakeholders to remove barriers to student success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To provide a nurturing learning community, committed to preparing young minds to be academically and socially competitive for college and career readiness.

### 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
Street, Gay	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader by overseeing all academic initiatives for Sparr. She supports instruction by facilitating collaboration and being present during classroom instruction. Furthermore, she provides consistent, quality learning opportunities for staff in an effort to enhance instructional practices and optimize resources. These efforts will in turn yield optimum learning opportunities for learners resulting in improved academic success for students.
Johnson, Renee	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal provides support for the vision and leadership of the principal by supporting Tier 1 instruction and learning opportunities. The assistant principal supports the collaborative process and follows through by seeing it through to impact during instruction. She provides coaching and learning opportunities for staff which yield enhanced instructional and learning opportunities.
McAdams, Kristen	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach supports the staff and administration by serving as a content area expert. She supports instruction via co-teaching and coaching opportunities. Furthermore, she supports collaboration by serving as a content area expert and provides feedback and guidance in the development of high quality, Tier 1 instruction.
Keene, Rachel	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach supports the staff and administration by serving as a content area expert. She support instruction via co-teaching and coaching opportunities. Furthermore, she support collaboration by serving as a content area expert and provides feedback and guidance in the development of high quality, Tier 1 instruction.
Hinson, Bashannon	Dean	The student services manager supports the overall academic goals of the school by providing organizational and behavioral management. She provides discipline support and serves as classroom management coach.
	School Counselor	The guidance counselor supports the mental health needs of students. She also support behavioral and academic interventions.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/2/2021, Renee Johnson

**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.*

1

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

18

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

380

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

8

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

7

### 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	47	51	54	55	65	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	322
Attendance below 90 percent	12	13	20	14	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	7	4	12	17	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Course failure in ELA	11	11	33	16	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Course failure in Math	8	7	35	19	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	5	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

**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	11	9	33	23	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

**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	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	

**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	37	46	53	60	63	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307
Attendance below 90 percent	13	22	28	24	29	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	4	13	12	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

**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	8	9	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	37	46	53	60	63	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307
Attendance below 90 percent	13	22	28	24	29	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	4	13	12	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
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	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

#### 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	8	9	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

#### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				36%	47%	57%	47%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	56%	58%	39%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	52%	53%	35%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				43%	51%	63%	44%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	58%	62%	40%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	49%	51%	35%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				47%	47%	53%	55%	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	26%	44%	-18%	58%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	31%	49%	-18%	62%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	45%	0%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	44%	-3%	53%	-12%
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	3 / 6%	5 / 10%	14 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 8%	3 / 8%	10 / 28%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 11%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2 / 4%	2 / 4%	20 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 3%	1 / 3%	15 / 43%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 25%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11 / 21%	11 / 20%	19 / 36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 19%	6 / 15%	10 / 27%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 17%	1 / 8%	2 / 17%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2 / 4%	2 / 4%	15 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 3%	2 / 5%	8 / 22%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 9%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12 / 23%	7 / 13%	10 / 18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 24%	6 / 15%	8 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 25%	1 / 20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2 / 4%	1 / 2%	9 / 17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 2%	1 / 2%	7 / 18%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11 / 18%	5 / 8%	12 / 19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 20%	4 / 9%	8 / 16%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 8%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3 / 5%	5 / 8%	21 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 / 4%	3 / 6%	16 / 32%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7 / 15%	3 / 6%	3 / 7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 14%	2 / 5%	1 / 3%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 13%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6 / 13%	4 / 8%	9 / 20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 8%	2 / 5%	6 / 18%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25 / 57%	22 / 46%	18 / 44%
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	16 / 47%	14 / 37%	11 / 35%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25 / 57%	22 / 46%	18 / 44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16 / 47%	14 / 37%	11 / 35%

## 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	10	50		7	50						
BLK	28	30		22	60		20				
HSP	30	55		35	55						
MUL	33			25							
WHT	57	78		69	94		69				
FRL	40	58	60	41	68		36				
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	8	56	67	12	58	58	30				
ELL	40			60							
BLK	27	53	67	27	76	75	30				
HSP	33	50		62	77						

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
MUL				30							
WHT	41	51	58	47	54	42	50				
FRL	34	57	68	40	66	60	52				
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	13	27		9	33						
ELL	50			50							
BLK	24	16		24	8						
HSP	58	46		63	62						
WHT	56	48	54	48	48	40	57				
FRL	43	38	39	41	35	35	51				

### 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	56
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	32
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	44
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	29
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	73
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	51
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?

The data indicates that the learning gains among all students and the learning gains among the bottom quartile have improved in both ELA and in math. From 2018 to 2019, in ELA, learning gains among all students increased from 39% to 54%, and then in 2021 the learning gains among all students continued the upward trend with 59%. Learning gains among the bottom quartile increased from 35% to 66% during the 2018 to 2019 school year. In 2021, while the learning gains among the bottom quartile dropped 2% to 64%. In math, learning gains among all students increased from 40% to 64%, and then in 2021 math learning gains increased to 69%. The learning gains among the bottom quartile increased from 35% to 59%, and in 2021 the learning gains among the bottom quartile jumped to 70%. The average learning gains in all students and in the bottom quartile in both ELA and Math learning gains among all student and among the bottom quartile indicate a consistent, upward trend.

In the area of proficiencies, math has remained stagnate in grades 3-5. During the 2017-2018 school year, the proficiency level was 44%, during the 2018-2019 percent, the proficiency level dropped to 43%, and during the 2020-2021 school year, the proficiency level was 46%. In ELA, during the 2017-2018 school year the proficiency level was 47%, in 2018-2019 the proficiency percentage dropped to 36%. In 2020-2021, proficiency levels continued to climb to 42%.

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

The data indicates that the greatest area of need is proficiency in math and in ELA. In ELA, student achievement dropped from 47% to 36%, and Math dropped from 44% to 43%. Furthermore, the 2019 FSA data reveals that in ELA, third-grade achievement levels were 18% lower than that of the district and 32% lower than the state average. Fourth-grade achievement was 5% below the district and 14% lower than the state average. Fifth grade was 12% below the district average and 23% below the state average. In math, third grade was 18% below district average and 31% below the state average. In fourth grade, the achievement average was 21% district average and 31% state average. Lastly, fifth-grade achievement was 15% below the state average. In 2021, the ELA achievement data indicated all student proficiency levels were 42% (compared to a district average of 44%), while math achievement was at a 46% (compared to a district average of 47%).

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

Some factors that contribute to the drop in student proficiency in both ELA and math include the lack of standards-based and aligned resources, curriculum, and lesson planning. Furthermore, collaborative planning was not being utilized to its fullest potential, therefore it was not having an optimal impact on Tier 1 instruction.

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

The data that showed the most improvement included the learning gains among all students and the learning gains among the bottom quartile in both ELA and in math.

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

Factors that contribute to this improvement include purposeful, small group support by personnel during instructional time.

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

Strategies to implement that will accelerate learning include purposeful small group instruction and a revision of the collaborative planning process. During the collaboration, there will be a focus on content that is aligned to the standard, engagement, and pacing, which will enhance Tier 1 instruction. Further, the use of achievement level descriptors during collaboration will help ensure that instruction and tasks are appropriately aligned to the DOK and standard. These efforts will not only yield higher student achievement and proficiency, but it will continue the upward trend in learning gains among all students and among the bottom quartile.

**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 opportunities will hone in on standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction (the instructional core, including task alignment, engagement, and pacing), and formative assessment for the purpose of data-based instructional decisions that will yield purposeful small group, standards-based instructional opportunities.

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

Administration and the instructional coaches will heavily support the revised collaboration process. Teachers will be supported during collaboration, while all instructional items are appropriately vetted. Achievement level descriptors will be referenced to help ensure adequate DOK and standards alignment of content. The collaborative process will be facilitated and guided by the administration and instructional coaches to ensure adequate learner engagement and pacing. Additionally, administration and coaches will inspect the implementation of the lessons during instruction, seeking evidence of collaboration, and will provide feedback and coaching as needed.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>The need for increased ELA proficiency among learners reveals a critical need for enhanced Tier 1 instruction that includes instruction that is aligned to the standard and the appropriate DOK level.</p> <p>Our 2021 ELA progress monitoring data shows the following percent of grades K-2 students not on track to secure a level 3 are: 83% of Kindergarten, 98% of 1st grade, and 89% of 2nd grade.</p> <p>During the 2020-2021 school year, our FSA data shows the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3: 69% of 3rd grade, 51% of 4th grade, and 62% of 5th grade. Improvements in the area of Tier 1 instruction will result in increased ELA proficiency among learners.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>On the 2021 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement, 17% of our kindergarten students were proficient, 2% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 11% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. On the 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement 22% of kindergarten, 22% of 1st grade, and 7% of 2nd grade students will be proficient (5 % higher for cohorts).</p> <p>On the 2021 ELA FSA, 31% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 49% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 38% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA , 35% of 3rd grade, 36% of 4th grade, and 54% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher (5% higher for cohorts).</p> <p>In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:  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, and Q3 March 2022.</p>
<b>Monitoring:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>During classroom walk throughs, levels of student engagement will be noted by administration and feedback will be provided to teachers.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is a revised collaborative planning process and professional development. Collaboration will include the utilization of test-item specifications provided by the FL DOE to help ensure that the tasks and lesson are aligned to the standard and at the appropriate DOK level and meeting two times per week with instructional coaches and administration. Professional development will include a focus on pacing and student engagement during direct instruction (.82 effect size on Hattie's index of teaching), and formative assessment (.9 effect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching).</p>
<b>Rationale for</b>	<p>During collaboration, teachers will have the opportunity to come together to share instructional strategies, learning goals, and tasks they plan to incorporate during the</p>

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

following week, This will be an opportunity for instructional coaches (content area experts) and administration (instructional leaders) to provide feedback in an effort to ensure standards-based, DOK appropriate content and tasks and highly effective instructional practices prior to the execution of the lesson. Further, during this time teachers will share and analyze data collected from classroom-based common assessments to review best practices for review and remediation.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Professional development will be provided to instructional staff on utilizing test item specifications for the purposes of task alignment and lesson planning. Further, professional development and coaching on pacing, student engagement, and formative assessment will be incorporated.

**Person Responsible** Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)

Weekly classroom walkthroughs by administration seeking content and task alignment to the standard(s) and evidence of collaboration.

**Person Responsible** Gay Street (gay.street@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.

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.**

Sparr Elementary continues to build a positive school culture and safe environment by creating norms, traditions, and beliefs. First, our mission and vision is created with the assistance of all stakeholders (students, staff, teachers, parents, School Advisory Committee and Sparr community). We build capacity by valuing our stakeholders and include them in the decision making processes including serving on committees. In addition, our committees set celebrations (both for students and adults), themes, and special

events to elevate our positive culture.

The school will incorporate the new SEL curriculum, Caring Schools Community, each day. Each stakeholder on campus works together to create a safe, positive school culture and environment for our learners. Each morning students engage in circle time, consistent with the parameters put forth by the Caring Schools curriculum, to begin the day on a positive, kind note. At the end of each day, Ms. Street addresses the staff and students with a positive and encouraging message to see the students off.

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

All stakeholders (students, teachers, staff, administration, parents, volunteers, School Advisory Council, Sparr Building and Farm Supply (Business Partner) and the Sparr community) will play a role in promoting a positive culture and safe environment.

Our students will learn and exhibit the "BIG 3" (Do what's right, Do your best and treat other the way you want to be treated) each and everyday as an extension of our PBIS commitment.

Ms. Grubbs, Guidance Counselor, is the lead on the Caring Schools Community initiative and oversees the implementation.

Ms. Hinson, Student Service Manager, works with the students, staff, volunteers, and parents in the continuation and expansion of our PBIS program to continue to create and build a positive school culture and safe environment.

## **Part V: Budget**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>