

Marion County Public Schools

Bellevue Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Belleview Elementary School

5556 SE COUNTY HIGHWAY 484, Belleview, FL 34420

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Victoria Thomas

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

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

Belleview Elementary School

5556 SE COUNTY HIGHWAY 484, Belleview, FL 34420

[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	42%

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.

Belleview Elementary School will provide a quality learning environment where students will learn and become responsible, self-sufficient citizens, who will be willing and able to become contributing members of our democratic society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students are learning to their maximum potential.

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
Thomas, Victoria	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and provide successful high-quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. Supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-instructional personnel assigned to the school.
Newmones, Stacie	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 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 specific areas.
Finnie, Jasmine	Math Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning in the area of math. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on needs in Math.
Levandowski, Cynthia	Reading Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning in the area of English/Language Arts. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on needs in English/Language Arts.
Boireau, Ernestine	School Counselor	To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach their full potential.
Clifford, Marty	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. In addition, work with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/5/2021, Victoria Thomas

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

1

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

560

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

5

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	92	102	103	83	101	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	572
Attendance below 90 percent	36	32	30	36	28	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	5	5	9	8	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	8	23	44	25	14	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
Course failure in Math	10	13	32	28	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	13	17	38	30	23	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	58	105	106	93	110	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	0	47	43	47	63	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	246
One or more suspensions	15	33	18	36	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
Course failure in ELA	0	2	16	2	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	2	14	2	19	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	4	10	6	27	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	58	105	106	93	110	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	0	47	43	47	63	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	246
One or more suspensions	15	33	18	36	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
Course failure in ELA	0	2	16	2	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	2	14	2	19	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	4	10	6	27	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	2	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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%	37%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	56%	58%	42%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	52%	53%	43%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				42%	51%	63%	38%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	58%	62%	35%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	49%	51%	17%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	47%	53%	32%	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	35%	44%	-9%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	39%	49%	-10%	62%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	45%	-13%	60%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	33%	44%	-11%	53%	-20%
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	20 / 21%	20 / 20%	32 / 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 20%	12 / 16%	24 / 32%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 43%	1 / 14%	2 / 29%
	English Language Learners	1 / 20%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6 / 6%	9 / 9%	24 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 6%	6 / 8%	15 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 14%	2 / 29%
	English Language Learners	1 / 20%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20 / 22%	20 / 20%	28 / 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 19%	12 / 16%	18 / 23%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 11%	2 / 22%	2 / 22%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8 / 9%	9 / 9%	24 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 8%	5 / 6%	15 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 11%	1 / 11%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30 / 39%	21 / 26%	31 / 37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19 / 31%	12 / 18%	20 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 13%	2 / 22%	1 / 11%
	English Language Learners	1 / 17%	1 / 17%	1 / 14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6 / 8%	5 / 6%	24 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 5%	4 / 6%	18 / 27%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 13%	0 / 0%	3 / 33%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 17%	1 / 14%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26 / 26%	11 / 11%	23 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18 / 23%	7 / 9%	15 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5 / 5%	11 / 11%	24 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 5%	8 / 10%	18 / 23%
	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	16 / 19%	8 / 9%	13 / 15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 18%	5 / 8%	10 / 16%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 10%	1 / 10%	1 / 10%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12 / 14%	7 / 8%	15 / 17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 15%	5 / 8%	10 / 16%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 20%	1 / 10%	2 / 20%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38 / 48%	25 / 30%	22 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25 / 43%	17 / 27%	14 / 23%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 40%	1 / 10%	1 / 10%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	31	53		31	59		31				
ELL	38			35							
BLK	18			32							
HSP	47	44		51	47		19				
MUL	55			60							
WHT	48	41	69	53	46	58	28				
FRL	41	38	64	49	43	59	23				
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	27	29	11	27	43	35	22				
ELL	14	35		33	35						
BLK	25	47		29	40						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	20	35	20	38	50	42	10				
MUL	38			20							
WHT	42	49	43	45	64	52	42				
FRL	31	37	30	37	51	35	38				
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	23	46	36	13	24	25	7				
ELL	29	38		24	15						
BLK	41	64		41	29						
HSP	29	35	29	32	26	8	43				
MUL	47	33		40	33						
WHT	39	42	44	40	38	15	27				
FRL	36	41	38	38	32	17	32				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	25
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	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	49
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	48
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 demonstrated student performance between 15 and 37 percent proficiency in ELA and 17 and 29 percent in Math across all grade levels. In addition, FSA Achievement levels over three years average 41% for ELA and 44% for Math, placing our students 17% below the state average in ELA and 18% below the state average in Math.

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

An analysis of the 2020-2021 i-Ready proficiency data demonstrated the largest deficits in the areas of both ELA or Math for rising 3rd graders. The 2019 FSA data additionally indicated a deficit in proficiency for 3rd grade, with 35% in reading and 39% in Math. This creates an urgency to correct these proficiency deficits by the 2022 state assessments.

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

The greatest contributing factor for this need for improvement is that 65% of the rising third graders were non-proficient in the area of phonics. In math, 67% of the rising third graders were non-proficient in Numbers and Operations. Providing explicit phonics and foundational skill instruction during Tier 1 instruction with consistency and fidelity would address this need for improvement. The action needed to improve the proficiency in Math would include teachers providing daily small group, differentiated instruction with fidelity.

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

ELA FSA proficiency increased by 9% in third grade, 15% in fourth grade, and 3% in fifth grade from the 2019 FSA assessment. The i-ready progress monitoring data also showed increases in ELA proficiencies from AP2 to AP3 by 9% in third grade, 12% in fourth grade, and 6% in fifth grade.

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

Most students received a double dose of grade-level standards instruction during the second block of MTSS. Additionally, during collaborative planning, teachers and the CAS worked together to develop standards-based Tier 1 instruction to support the needs of all students. Another corrective action for "on the verge", or close to proficiency students, was additional after-school tutoring.

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

School-wide Tier 1 ELA and Math lessons will be structured in a gradual release model with frequent formative assessment to determine students' understanding. Furthermore, teacher resources will be vetted during collaborative planning for alignment to the depth of the standard. Content Area Specialist for ELA and Math, as well as administration, will work closely with teachers; promoting purposeful and profitable instructional planning and monitoring instructional delivery.

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 address teacher pedagogy. Teachers will develop skillsets with strategies to create meaningful formative assessments, learn to choose/create student activities that are vetted and are aligned to the depth and the complexity of the standard and learn high yield teaching strategies to improve Tier 1 instruction for all learners.

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

After-school tutoring will be offered during the school year to promote proficiency in ELA and Math. Student data analysis will be done monthly during collaboration sessions. Content Area Specialist will work collaboratively to consistently monitor Tier 1 instruction through walkthroughs and/or observations.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Over 50% of students in grades 3-5 remain non-proficient in the area of ELA based on the last 2 years of FSA data.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide teachers with professional development focused on developing high yield instructional strategies during Tier 1 instruction, develop/choose productive and purposeful formal assessments and student activities that are vetted and aligned to the depth and complexity of the standard, then proficiency will increase from 44% to 49% for third grade, 50% to 55% for fourth grade and 36% to 41% in fifth grade as measured by district data analysis, QSMA's, and FSA.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will take place using data from the following: *K-5 - i-Ready Diagnostic AP1, AP2, and AP3 data *K-5 - i-Ready Growth Monitoring in November 2021 and March 2022 *3-5 - District QSMA data, *3-5 - District Demand Writing *3-5 - 2022 FSA ELA Assessment
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacie Newmones (stacie.newmones@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers participate in in-depth, intentional, and purposeful collaborative planning with grade and subject area peers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies, "Teachers that participate in effective and intentional planning and prediction has the potential to accelerate student achievement with an effect size of .76."

Action Steps to Implement

One action step is professional development will be provided to instructional staff to build capacity in the use of the gradual release model and formative assessments to drive daily instruction. Another action step is that teachers will collaboratively plan lessons for the alignment and depth of the standards and lesson resources and tasks will be vetted for standard alignment.

Person Responsible Victoria Thomas (victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Only 51% of 3rd through 5th graders are proficient in Math based on the 2021 FSA Math Assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	If students in all grades receive explicit teacher-led and hands-on math instruction, to build a solid foundation in Numbers and Operations, then math proficiencies will increase from 48% to 53% in third grade, 53% to 57% in fourth grade, and 42% to 47 % in fifth grade.
Monitoring:	Collaborative planning, CAS learning walks, and principal and assistant principal consistent monitoring of T1 instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jasmine Finnie (jasmine.finnie@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The following strategies will be used to support our teachers: 1. Collaborative Planning 2. Professional Development 3. Disaggregate Data 4. CAS Modeling/Co-teaching
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "Explicit Teacher-Led Instruction in Mathematics programs" has an effect size of 0.65, If teachers are deliberate in planning and implementing Explicit Teacher-Led instruction, then math proficiency will increase.

Action Steps to Implement**Action Steps:**

During collaboration, teachers will plan explicit math lessons incorporating the use of manipulatives and develop and use formal assessments that address the complexity and rigor of the standards to drive daily instruction.

Person Responsible Jasmine Finnie (jasmine.finnie@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.

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 relationship 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.

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

We continuously consult with our stakeholders: teachers, students, families, volunteers, and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting these stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies. Teachers provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with district philosophy goals and objectives. Students' Families provide support by taking an active role in their child's education. Volunteers work with students to assist with academics while connecting the community with the school. They also provide services to the school's physical environment.

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