Marion County Public Schools

Emerald Shores Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Emerald Shores Elementary School

404 EMERALD RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Stacy Houston

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 (41%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (42%)
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.](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

Emerald Shores Elementary School

404 EMERALD RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[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 KG-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	64%

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.

As a team, we will build a respectful, supportive community focused on clear communication, consistent expectations, and engaging learning opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To inspire and motivate students to become compassionate, productive, and honest citizens within our society.

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
Houston, Stacy	Principal	MCIES Observations; Summative Evaluations for Instructional & Non-instructional employees; Crisis Management; CIMS/SIP; Budgets; PFEP; Staff Discipline; Staff Handbook; Parent Handbook; SAC/PTO; Community Liaison.
McPhee, Monica	Assistant Principal	MCIES Observations; Pre-K Point Person; MTSS - Academic PMP's & PST's for specified students; Curriculum - PK - 5th grade; 3rd Grade Portfolios; Skyward Gradebook - Report Cards/Interim Reports; Award's & Graduation Ceremonies - Planning, organization, & ordering; EOY Student sorts & assist IPC with student scheduling in Skyward; Elementary Testing Coordinator; 504 Meetings & ESOL Staffings; Weekly INformer Creation & Panther Press; Kagan Coaching (Structure of the month); Update Sharepoint; SAC/PTO.
Rowe, James	Assistant Principal	MCIES Observations; Discipline - point person; MTSS - Behavior plans & PST's for specified students; PMP meetings; Assist in preparing staff for ALICE & Fire drills; MDT Team; Materials management - textbook inventory & distribution, chromebook carts, destiny; Threat assessment referrals; Enter PD courses in TNL; Safety Chair; Volunteer approval; Facilitation of staff furniture moves; SAC & PTO.
Ashberger, Kelly	Math Coach	Model & provide classroom support/coaching for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; i-Ready Monitoring for math; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for math; MTSS Interventions coordinator; Enter math data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various math programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for para-professionals; Implement & monitor data folders for math.
Ewart, Samantha	School Counselor	Guidance Services; IEP Staffings as needed; MTSS; Campus Life Changer / SEL; School Liaison for outside agencies; DCF calls; MDT Meeting Coordinator; Suicide Risk; Coordinate & Organize Donations; Counseling Groups; Holiday Assistance; Food Backpacks; 504 Contact; CUME Folder Reviews; Monitor Attendance/Tardies; ESE Students - Tier 3; Gifted, Academic, Mental, & Behavioral Referrals.
Fortner, Peggy	Science Coach	Model & provide classroom support for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for science; Enter science data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various science programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for para-professionals; schedule and provide hands-on labs with 3-5 classes on a bi-weekly basis.
Maio, Brittany	Reading Coach	Model & provide classroom support/coaching for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; i-Ready Monitoring for reading; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for ELA; MTSS Interventions coordinator; Enter reading data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		reading programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for para-professionals; Implement & monitor data folders for reading; Literacy Committee; Lead ITD.
Ricks, Marcia	Dean	Discipline; Cafeteria Supervisor - train paras; Assist in preparing staff for ALICE & Fire drills; Distribute Crisis Management plans; PST Meetings for Discipline; Transportation/Bus safety issues; Model & support teachers with Classroom Management; ISS Facilitator; Threat Risk Referrals; Alternative Placements/Expulsions; Patrols.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Stacy Houston

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

578

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

4

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	91	109	99	96	96	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	54	49	41	45	38	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271
One or more suspensions	2	8	7	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	18	23	30	21	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
Course failure in Math	19	21	36	17	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	22	24	34	23	27	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	70	125	107	99	98	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	24	21	16	18	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	17	16	13	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA	0	2	7	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	8	12	19	27	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	70	125	107	99	98	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	24	21	16	18	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	17	16	13	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA	0	2	7	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	8	12	19	27	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				34%	47%	57%	36%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	56%	58%	37%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	52%	53%	26%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				32%	51%	63%	36%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				42%	58%	62%	40%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	49%	51%	34%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				34%	47%	53%	46%	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	32%	49%	-17%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	45%	-11%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	62%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	64%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2021					
	2019	25%	45%	-20%	60%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

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				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/11	10/9	19/17
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/10	4/4	11/12
	Students With Disabilities	4/29	0/0	3/20
	English Language Learners	1/17	1/13	1/13
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/6	5/5	17/15
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/6	3/3	13/14
	Students With Disabilities	2/14	1/6	2/13
	English Language Learners	1/17	0/0	0/0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/18	20/20	25/27
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/18	17/21	18/23
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/10	12/12	18/19
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/11	12/15	17/23
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/34	18/19	33/34
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/29	9/12	21/28
	Students With Disabilities	1/6	0/0	2/12
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/5	6/6	17/18
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/6	3/4	7/9
	Students With Disabilities	1/7	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/25	0/0	0/0

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/15	14/15	13/14
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/15	12/16	12/16
	Students With Disabilities	1/6	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/10	8/9	17/18
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/8	5/7	12/16
	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	15/18	9/10	12/13
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/18	4/5	7/9
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/10	8/9	11/13
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/6	2/3	5/7
	Students With Disabilities	1/9	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/50	1/25
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/44	26/29	21/26
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/36	20/27	16/24
	Students With Disabilities	1/9	2/17	1/11
	English Language Learners	2/100	1/50	1/50

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	21		3	25						
ELL	17	50		33	30						
BLK	20	27		9	21	30	5				
HSP	42	45		38	36		26				
MUL	32	67		21	27						
WHT	43	41		46	37		35				
FRL	31	37	37	24	27	29	15				
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	17	56	65	20	45	50	33				
ELL	26	57		41	43		30				
BLK	23	48	55	23	40	30	20				

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	40	53	58	38	40		29				
MUL	30	39		27	39						
WHT	43	60	58	35	46	50	48				
FRL	30	50	59	28	41	33	28				

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	14	35	42	17	41		27				
ELL	39	43		39	29						
BLK	25	34	36	31	38	31	46				
HSP	35	34	40	37	35		39				
MUL	35	38		25	38						
WHT	46	40		40	46	40	60				
FRL	34	37	26	34	41	34	45				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	298
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	19
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	42
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	40
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	34
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?

Student performance using grade-level progress monitoring tools from iReady consistently demonstrated student performance below 35% proficiency across all grade levels for both ELA and Math for over 3 years. FSA Achievement levels over 3 years averaged 35% for ELA, 33% for Math, and 28% for the State Science Assessment.

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

An analysis of 2020-2021 i-Ready proficiency data demonstrated the largest deficits in proficiency in rising third, fourth and fifth graders. This creates an urgency to correct these deficits, and get students performing on grade level. These were also the most critically underperforming. i-Ready Spring diagnostic data reflects proficiency levels below 35% across all grade levels in third to fifth grade. This is supported in the release of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) data for student achievement in ELA and Math.

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

Contributing factors include the Fall i-Ready assessment showing 65-70% of the students begin the year working below grade level; an increase in student absences and tardies; students suffering from traumatic events; and high mobility rates. Students suffering from severe traumatic events will have a mentor assigned. Changes to collaborative planning sessions to assist in an increase in teacher efficacy. Implementation of mindfulness, breathing, and meditation strategies daily and implementation of the Caring School Community program for SEL.

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

Based on the 2021 state assessment data the one area that showed some improvement was in ELA proficiency with a one-point gain. While all of the other components showed a decrease we did earn 50 percentage points in our ELA Lowest quartile.

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

Use of goal setting throughout the year for all students and scheduling an MTSS block that grouped students based on their skill deficits within their homeroom classrooms. Homeroom teachers were expected to provide a variety of interventions based on each child's deficit, but they spent additional time with the students that were identified as being in the lowest quartile. Students in the lowest

quartile were also pulled into small groups and provided with intense remediation of standards in clusters 1 and 2.

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

During collaboration, teachers will use the achievement level descriptors to intentionally plan for level 4 and 5 learning. Ongoing formative assessments will be administered and collected to measure students' level of mastery. This will provide data for the teachers to know which students to accelerate and which to intervene and reteach as needed. Resources and tasks will be previewed during collaboration.

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 around the achievement level descriptors and how to intentionally plan for level 4 and 5 learning. Content area specialists will model or co-teach to support acceleration as needed. Ongoing professional development on how to move beyond collecting formative assessment data to then use it to enhance student learning. The leadership team will conduct instructional rounds to look for task alignment to the achievement levels and use of formative assessment data. The instructional rounds will provide information to the leadership team to support collaboration and professional learning.

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

The Leadership Team will continue to support teachers and staff members through a teamwork philosophy. We also have a new Home School Liaison we will use to make contacts with families and provide additional supports, helping to continue to support community and family partnerships.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	3-5 ELA Proficiency has been at or below 37% since 2018 and math proficiency has trended below 36% since 2017 as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).

Measurable Outcome:	If we provide all instructional staff professional learning focusing on intentional standards-based planning, how to effectively collect and use formative assessment data, and on-going coaching, then our overall ELA and math proficiency in grades 3-5 as measured by FSA will increase by 6% from 35% to 41% in ELA and by 5% from 31% to 36% in math.
Monitoring:	K-5: i-Ready Reading & Math Diagnostic AP1 August 2021, AP2 January 2022, and AP3 May 2022 K-5: i-Ready & Math Reading Growth Monitoring November 2021 and March 2022 3-5: District Reading & Math QSMA Q1 October 2021, Q2 December 2021, Q3 March 2022 3-5: 2022 FSA ELA & Math Proficiency Teachers will participate in weekly data meetings with the leadership team during collaboration to monitor student progress on formative assessments. They will also meet quarterly after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps to intervene and respond to the assessment results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers participate in weekly collaboration with the support of the leadership team and grade level peers focusing on the standard and task alignment. Teachers will also collect, share, and utilize formative assessment data to increase student learning.
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

Creation of a Master Schedule allowing time for teachers to fully implement whole group initial instructional lessons and small group instructional lessons based on the daily formative assessments in ELA & Math.

Schedule and assign administrators to weekly data meetings and collaborative planning sessions that content area specialists, grade level teachers, and support facilitators attend. Tuesday data meetings will require teachers to bring the agreed-upon standards-based task and review proficiency in the standard for individual students and use the data to make changes to instruction for the current week. Wednesday and Thursday collaborative planning sessions will require teachers to have already planned for the core subject areas allowing for in-depth conversations revolving around instructional practices. Create a weekly walk-through schedule for administrators to observe classroom instruction of the planned lessons from the collaborative sessions and provide in-the-moment coaching and feedback to the teachers.

Person Responsible	Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@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

<div style="background-color:navy;color:white;">

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.

</div>

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

1. Teachers are required to make individual parent phone calls during the first 2 weeks of the school year in order to communicate goals and begin to establish a positive partnership between school and home.
2. The school utilizes Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram as a means of positive communication within the community.
3. Administration sends out a weekly Skylert message called the Panther Press to families every Sunday evening updating families on important weekly events.
4. The school has partnered with the following community-based stakeholders: Kiwanis Club of Marion County; Junior League of Marion County; the Early Learning Coalition of Marion County; and the Children's Alliance of Marion County.
5. We have a new Home School Liaison that will make daily calls to families of absent students to determine needs and provide support. She will also sponsor events throughout the year with the goal of increasing family engagement.
6. Teachers will implement lessons from the Caring School Community SEL curriculum daily to support student SEL needs.

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

Principal - lead the organization by providing transparent communication, and using the established core values, school mission, and vision as the basis for all decision making.
A-team members (Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselor, Student Service Manager, and Content Area Specialists) - support the school's core values, mission, and vision by helping the Principal lead.
Teachers - create a vision and implement class-wide goals that are communicated with students regularly. Communicate with families through weekly newsletters, classroom dojo, email, and phone to create a partnership that will support student needs.
Non-instructional staff - support teacher needs in the classroom.
Office staff - provide a positive and welcoming environment for families when they visit the school.

Families - support the mission and vision of the school by being an active participant in student growth and development.
Students - take ownership over their own learning.

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
		Total:	$0.00