East Marion Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

East Marion Elementary School

14550 NE 14TH STREET RD, Silver Springs, FL 34488

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Dobbs   Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2020

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* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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

East Marion Elementary School

14550 NE 14TH STREET RD, Silver Springs, FL 34488

[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	18%

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.

The mission at East Marion Elementary (EME) is to work within our school community to create an environment that encourages our students to take ownership of their learning with the end goal for all students to become critical thinkers, problem solvers, and life-long learners as a result of rigorous and effective instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At East Marion Elementary (EME), our purpose for the future of our students is to work with all stakeholders in order to provide and support a safe learning environment that delivers relevant instruction for all students. As part of that vision, we will focus on including purposeful, authentic learning opportunities which will allow all students to apply what they have learned as it relates to the "real world" and the resulting impact their learning has on their choices for the future.

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
Borge-Shaffer, Deborah	Principal	As the instructional leader of the school, the principal will strive to guide the use of data-based decision making, progress monitor tiered groups of intervention, strategically plan differentiated professional development for all staff members via collaborative planning, allocate personnel/material resources strategically, conducts scheduled evaluative instructional/non-instructional observations (MCIES) and develops and maintains the Title I/ District Budgets, Most importantly the principal will work toward building a strong school community where relationships are the foundation of the school culture as it relates to the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional success of all students (SAC/PTO; Crisis Management; and MDT) as well as facilitating grade-level collaborative meetings.
Laplante, Allison	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision of how data-based decision-making impacts the implementation of high yield instructional strategies on Tier I instruction, monitoring student response to interventions/documentation (MTSS; PMP, PST), scheduling of support staff to assist with differentiated small group instruction. The Assistant Principal is also responsible for the scheduling and implementation of district/state assessments, as well as assisting in scheduled evaluative observations (MCIES). Maintains textbook/technology inventories, provides teachers with curriculum support and facilitates grade-level collaborative meetings.
Roberts, Steven	Dean	The Student Services Manager (SSM) is responsible for the implementation of school safety initiatives that establish a safe and orderly learning environment, schedules routine drills, and collaborates with staff to develop effective programs that promote positive behavior and classroom management. It is also the responsibility of the SSM to act as the lead for the School Safety Committee, PBIS team, and a member of the Crisis Response team. The SSM maintains behavior/discipline documentation providing up-to-date data to the Administrative team. The SSM serves as the school liaison to the MCSO School Resource Officer and the district's Safe Schools department.
Nieb, Heather	School Counselor	The Guidance counselor participates as part of the problem-solving team with a focus on the collection and interpretation of data, facilitates intervention plans for individual students (Multi-Disciplinary Team); and coordinates the behavioral screening assessments. The counselor acts as the liaison between families and community agencies that provide specialized services. The counselor leads professional training for staff that is central to the implementation of social-emotional learning instruction in the classroom.
Rivera, Stephanie	School Counselor	The Guidance counselor participates as part of the problem-solving team with a focus on the collection and interpretation of data, facilitates intervention plans for individual students (Multi-Disciplinary Team); and coordinates the behavioral screening assessments. The counselor acts as the liaison between families and community agencies that provide specialized services.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		The counselor leads professional training for staff that is central to the implementation of social-emotional learning instruction in the classroom.
Mobley, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	The ELA Instructional Coach works directly with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach's focus will be on developing individual and group professional development that will enhance teachers understanding of research-based literacy best practices. The Instructional coach will provide differentiated support that is based on the goals and needs of individual teachers as it relates to the school improvement plan. The Instructional Coach will also act as the Lead Instructional Talent Developer and will coordinate the mentoring and induction program for the new/early career teachers.
	Instructional Coach	(Yet to be hired) - The Math/Science Instructional Coach works directly with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach's focus will be on developing individual and group professional development that will enhance teachers understanding of research-based math/science instructional practices. The Instructional coach will provide differentiated support that is based on the goals and needs of individual teachers as it relates to the school improvement plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/6/2020, Sarah Dobbs

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
48

Total number of students enrolled at the school
590

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
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	87	100	102	101	89	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	44	65	50	56	55	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308
One or more suspensions	3	11	6	11	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	14	29	29	28	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Course failure in Math	16	34	23	21	22	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	10	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	17	40	32	35	25	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180

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	4	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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	61	105	96	101	92	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	19	51	45	41	28	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217
One or more suspensions	0	17	7	12	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	7	4	19	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	6	4	17	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	15	7	10	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	3	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	61	105	96	101	92	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	19	51	45	41	28	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217
One or more suspensions	0	17	7	12	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	7	4	19	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	6	4	17	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	15	7	10	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	3	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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				41%	47%	57%	42%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	56%	58%	46%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	52%	53%	46%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				37%	51%	63%	43%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				44%	58%	62%	49%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	49%	51%	30%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	47%	53%	59%	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	36%	44%	-8%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	45%	-3%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	60%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	44%	2%	53%	-7%
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	11/12	11/11	26/26
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/13	11/13	24/27
	Students With Disabilities	2/11	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7/8	6/6	21/21
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/9	6/7	19/21
	Students With Disabilities	1/6	1/6	1/6
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22/25	19/20	28/29
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/26	14/18	20/25
	Students With Disabilities	4/25	2/12	4/22
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/100	1/100
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/13	10/11	20/21
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/10	7/9	13/16
	Students With Disabilities	2/13	2/12	2/12
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28/31	23/23	21/21
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/28	17/20	12/14
	Students With Disabilities	3/16	1/5	3/15
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/9	7/7	15/15
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/5	3/4	9/11
	Students With Disabilities	1/5	1/5	1/5
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	18/23	13/15	14/17
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/18	9/12	10/14
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	10/13	5/6	13/16
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/11	1/1	8/11
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	12/15	6/7	9/11
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/15	5/7	6/9
	Students With Disabilities	2/20	1/8	1/9
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	14/18	6/7	12/15
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/18	3/4	10/15
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	27/38	20/25	21/27
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/39	17/26	17/26
	Students With Disabilities	1/13	1/10	1/10
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	25	27	13			10				
HSP	71			47							
WHT	35	50	41	30	27	5	38				
FRL	33	47	37	26	26	6	31				

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	11	27	14	18	41	33	16				
HSP	55	55		47	40						
MUL	45			60							
WHT	40	51	40	36	45	34	50				
FRL	36	47	42	32	40	35	43				

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	9	39	46	19	19	15	29				
HSP	36	43		41	36						
MUL	60			60							
WHT	42	46	46	43	50	31	61				
FRL	39	44	47	39	46	29	56				

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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
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	225
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	12

Students With Disabilities	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
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	32
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on state assessment ELA data, 3rd-grade proficiency is trending downward, starting at 33% in 2018 and 28% in 2021. 4th grade is trending downward, starting at 42% in 2018 and 38% in 2021. 5th grade is trending downward, starting at 50% in 2018 and remaining at 46% in 2021. ELA Achievement is trending downward, starting at 41% in 2018 and 37% in 2021. ELA Learning Gains is trending upward, starting at 45% in 2018 and 49% in 2021. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile is unchanging, starting at 43% and 43% in 2021.

Based on FSA Math data, 3rd-grade proficiency is trending downward, starting at 35% in 2018 and 25% in 2021. 4th-grade proficiency is trending downward, starting at 49% in 2018 and 32% in 2021. 5th-grade proficiency is trending downward, starting at 44% in 2018 and 28% in 2021. Math Achievement is trending downward, starting at 42% in 2018 and 30% in 2021. Math Learning Gains is trending downward, starting at 54% in 2018 and 27% in 2021. Math Lowest 25th Percentile is trending downward, starting at 40% in 2018 and 5% in 2021.

Based on the Statewide Science Assessment data, 5th-grade proficiency is trending downward, starting at 57% in 2018 and 35% in 2021. Likewise, science Achievement is trending downward, starting at 40% in 2018 and 35% in 2021.

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

Based on FSA Math data from 2018-2021 and supported by local progress monitoring data, we can note a grade level proficiency decline as follows: 3rd grade -10%, 4th grade -17%, and 5th grade -16%. We can also see a decline in the following school grade component areas as follows: Math Achievement -12%, Math Learning Gains -27%, and Math Lowest 25th Percentile -35%.

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

Interruptions of instruction (online to traditional). Access for online students to receive differentiated instruction. Interventions started for online students after it started for traditional students. Online students had difficulty accessing technology and when they could access it, they had difficulty

navigating technology. The majority of SWD were online for the first semester, when they came back to campus we were unable to make up the gap before assessing. Family support for online students was weak.

Student attendance must increase in order for students to receive instruction. Guidance and social work assistant is monitoring attendance more frequently and being proactive in contacting families (no more than 3 absences). The HSL will also be working with families to assist with instructional needs when a student cannot be on campus. A student attendance recognition is in place to reward students with good attendance.

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

ELA Learning Gains increased from 2018-2021 by +4%. Although gains were not seen by grade level in ELA, we can note that based on the FSA data, we had the smallest decrease over a 3 year period.

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

Scheduling of small group instruction was data-driven, groups were routinely adjusted, and student response to intervention was monitored. Grade levels worked together to deliver small group instruction (grades 3-5). We offered after-school tutoring (grades 3-5) delivered by certified staff with an ELA focus.

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

Tier I Math/ELA instruction will be structured to provide students with hands-on learning experiences that are aligned to the depth of the standard while grade-level tasks are appropriate and meet the rigor and complexity of the standard in order to accelerate mastery of the content. Differentiated intervention in Math for all students K-5 to develop a strong base focused on foundational skills and the Intervention teacher will facilitate intensive small group intervention for Tier 3 students. Implementation of Universal Design for Learning that will address individual student needs and ability to access instruction.

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.

During grade-level collaborative planning, data will be used to drive the professional development needs of grade-level teachers. A focus of collaborative planning will be improving Tier I instruction in ELA and Math K-5 using classroom data, and local assessments. Coaches will facilitate grade-level collaborative planning twice weekly and assist with data analysis, next steps, and will provide coaching, co-teaching, and modeling as required. Teachers will be accountable for their students' data. The teacher must understand the standard and drill down to what are they doing, how are they teaching it, does it end with standard mastery. Additional professional development will be offered outside of collaborative planning that will enhance staff's understanding of inclusive practices that impact students' academic success.

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

Continue professional development opportunities based on student data and teacher need that has been identified during grade-level collaborative planning. Interventions will have support facilitators collaboration, additional para-professional support will push in during small group instruction. To

increase the effectiveness of Tier I teachers we will implement and increase the use of transformation lessons and utilization of district-provided support and resources.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the state (2018-2021) and local data, ELA and Math proficiency has been trending downward. It is imperative to ensure Tier I instruction is meeting the depth and rigor of the standard and tasks are aligned and grade-level appropriate.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers teach to the depth of the standard and use formative assessment to drive daily instructional decisions, then based on the 2022 data, the following increases in proficiencies will occur: ELA increase in proficiency by 3%: 3rd grade from 28% to 31% 4th grade from 38 to 41 5th grade from 46 to 49 Math increase in proficiency by 2%: 3rd grade from 25 to 27 4th grade from 32 to 34 5th grade from 28 to 30
Monitoring:	I Ready Diagnostic Data and Progress Monitoring and district assessments. Data will be analyzed during grade level cp to assess needs for intervention or acceleration and ensure that instruction is aligned to the depth of the standard. Coaches will routinely monitor/assist with the implementation of instruction best practices. Administration will routinely conduct instructional walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development on student achievement and formative evaluations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development on student achievement (.51 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) ensuring teachers understand and teach to the depth of the standard and formative evaluations (.90 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) teachers attending to what is happening for each student in their classroom as a result of their teaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Coaches will facilitate grade-level collaborative planning twice weekly and assist with data analysis, next steps, and will provide coaching, co-teaching, and modeling as required. Teachers will be accountable for their students data. The teacher must understand the standard and drill down to what are they doing, how are they teaching it, does it end with standard mastery.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Mobley (kimberly.mobley@marion.k12.fl.us)

To increase the effectiveness of Tier I instruction (K-5) in reading and math student task alignment and learning activities will be created and delivered to the depths and complexity of the standard. Classrooms will be monitored to ensure that student work remains at the level needed to reflect student mastery of the standard. Students will be provided with exemplars to increase their understanding of the skills needed and the expectations for standards mastery.

Person Responsible	Allison Laplante (allison.laplante@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the attendance data (2018-2021) EME has been experiencing an upward trend of K-5 students reported with less than 90% daily attendance (166 in 2018 vs 308 in 2021). Therefore there must be a concerted effort to monitor and intervene with those students in order to ensure that they are receiving the maximum number of instructional minutes that support students' academic success.
Measurable Outcome:	If school stakeholders receive targeted professional development and ongoing support to implement social-emotional learning and restorative discipline practices, then the number of K-5 students reporting attendance below 90% will decrease from 308 to 296.
Monitoring:	Daily student attendance reports (tardies, absences, early check-outs) Individualized attendance intervention plan Child Study Team Meetings (collaboration with Social Worker)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Allison Laplante (allison.laplante@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	High expectations for students in reference to students' expectations for and belief in themselves.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Development of high expectations for each student (1.44 effect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) involving students predicting and self-reporting. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to be involved in predicting their performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development for instructional/non-instructional staff focused on improving student attendance utilizing resources from Attendance Works and restorative practices. Emphasize school-wide attendance expectations (student and staff) with the slogan: "On time and Ready to Learn" and provide recognition opportunities weekly.

Person Responsible	Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)

School counselors will work collaboratively to communicate with parents consistently on the importance of attendance and its impact on instruction through monthly newsletters and personalized phone calls to families.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Rivera (stephanie.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us)

School counselors will facilitate the implementation of the Caring School Community (SEL program) by providing them with professional development and the school-wide integration of monthly cultural awareness throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Heather Nieb (heather.nieb1@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.

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.

We continuously consult with our 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. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:
• A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
• Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
• Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
• Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
• Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys, and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys. School staff, families, and volunteers work together to promote a safe environment and positive school culture. School staff will promote a positive learning environment with the implementation of the Caring School Community SEL program and the implementation of our PBIS program. The school administrative staff along with a committee of staff volunteers promotes a positive culture by recognizing both students and staff throughout the year in order to celebrate learning in a safe environment. The administrative team, teachers, and paraprofessionals will plan and implement parent night events that will build the capacity of parents to use at home to enhance their students' learning at home.

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

The key stakeholders for East Marion Elementary (EME) include the United Way of Marion County which provides volunteers to mentor students and promote literacy through their "Reading Pals" program. Our community business partner, American Dream Residential, provides monetary support which provides funds for basic resources given to all our students. The Marion County Public Education Foundation provides social and instructional capital that directly impacts teachers such as Tools for Teaching and grant

opportunities. EME works closely with the Forest Library to promote literacy events that are open to the school community and our families. The Ocala Park and Recreation Department have supported EME by sponsoring community events that provide our families and students with school readiness resources. The goal of all EME stakeholders is to remove all barriers to learning and to provide built-in support for families in order to improve students' academic success and to create a safe learning environment where students can grow and learn.

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00