Fessenden Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fessenden Elementary School

4200 NW 89TH PL, Ocala, FL 34482

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Stacie Newmones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: F (25%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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

Fessenden Elementary School

4200 NW 89TH PL, Ocala, FL 34482

[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	71%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Fessenden will build and foster positive working relationships, a learning environment that is student-centered and includes a community of citizens that are excited, committed, and motivated in the belief that all of our students are capable learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fessenden staff will continually develop as professionals in order to adapt to the academic, emotional, and social needs of ourselves and our students.

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
Redd, Lacy	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. The employee in this position supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school and reports to the assigned administrator
Woods, Shawn	Assistant Principal	To aid the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Stokes, Moneshia	Math Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of math and science utilizing effective professional development practices to build the capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning.
Slagle, Mary	Reading Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of literacy utilizing effective professional development practices to build the capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning.
Jackson, Jasmine	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. Reports to Principal and/or Assistant Principal and supervises assigned support staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/11/2018, Stacie Newmones

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
26

Total number of students enrolled at the school
380

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	58	58	59	64	72	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	24	26	18	30	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	3	3	4	1	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	2	15	23	15	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in Math	1	6	13	7	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	3	14	16	11	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	77	66	60	83	56	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	37	34	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	77	66	60	83	56	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	37	34	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				30%	47%	57%	26%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	56%	58%	27%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	52%	53%	28%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				31%	51%	63%	34%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				43%	58%	62%	20%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	49%	51%	21%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				29%	47%	53%	21%	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	24%	44%	-20%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	49%	-9%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	45%	-14%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	37%	49%	-12%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	15%	54%	-39%	64%	-49%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-37%					
05	2021						
	2019	36%	45%	-9%	60%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-15%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021						
	2019	31%	44%	-13%	53%	-22%
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	1 / 2%	6 / 11%	10 / 18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0 / 0%	3 / 7%	6 / 13%
	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	0 / 0%	2 / 4%	9 / 16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0 / 0%	1 / 2%	6 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 9%	1 / 9%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10 / 18%	10 / 17%	16 / 28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 17%	6 / 14%	11 / 26%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 25%	0 / 0%	1 / 25%
	English Language Learners	2 / 25%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1 / 2%	5 / 9%	13 / 22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0 / 0%	2 / 5%	6 / 14%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 25%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 11%	1 / 11%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20 / 33%	12 / 19%	24 / 38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 31%	8 / 16%	17 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 20%	1 / 20%	1 / 20%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3 / 5%	1 / 2%	14 / 22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 6%	0 / 0%	10 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 20%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6 / 9%	4 / 6%	4 / 6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 8%	3 / 5%	2 / 4%
	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	7 / 11%	3 / 4%	12 / 17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 12%	2 / 4%	7 / 13%
	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	10 / 21%	7 / 13%	10 / 18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 16%	4 / 9%	7 / 17%
	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	6 / 13%	5 / 9%	8 / 15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 8%	2 / 5%	4 / 10%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 17%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19 / 40%	15 / 31%	15 / 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 38%	10 / 26%	10 / 26%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 33%	1 / 33%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 17%	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	13			25							
ELL	35	54		43	62		45				
BLK	33	47		27	37		21				
HSP	44	50		46	56		43				
WHT	46	71		38	23		42				
FRL	35	48	55	32	36		30				

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	35		14	31						
ELL	35	44		38	35		18				
BLK	19	50	50	21	41	47	19				
HSP	29	52		35	41		24				
WHT	44	50		42	49		53				
FRL	23	49	56	29	47	58	24				

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	29	45	18	19	20					
ELL	21	24		25	6						
BLK	17	25	29	28	23	22	9				
HSP	34	28		38	14		25				
WHT	34	31		40	23		38				
FRL	23	27	29	31	20	23	16				

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	337
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	33
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	52
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	
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	44
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	44
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?

Significantly below district and state proficiency in Reading, Mathematics, and Science. 2020-2021 improved ELA proficiency from 30% in 18-19 to 39% in 20-21. Improved Math Proficiency from 31% to 36%. Improved Science Proficiency from 29% to 34%. ELL, ESE, and Black students continue to be most at risk.

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

1st, 4th and 5th show very low proficiency rates (below 20%) in ELA and Mathematics. Students with disabilities and ELL students show the most need for growth.

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

Continuing to have Kindergartners coming up to first grade with significant phonics issues. Implementation of new reading series and continuing our UFLI intervention to address. An improved model of collaboration to include high yield teaching strategies as a focus this year should improve instruction in all areas.

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

ELA SWD improved proficiency from 9% to 17%, ELL from 21% to 35%, White from 34% to 44%.

Math Learning Gains improved SWD 19% to 31%, ELL 6% to 35%, BLK 23% to 41%
Math LQ Black improved from 22% to 47% and FRL improved from 23% to 58%

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

After school tutoring, Monitored fidelity of intervention programs, improved collaborative planning, and data analysis, provided teachers with quality feedback.

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

Continue to refine feedback practices and data analysis. Collaborative Planning to include more emphasis on high-quality teaching strategies. Use of home school Liaison to improve attendance rates.

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.

Gradual Release Model Training, Print Rich Environment, Tools for struggling learners, cycles of coaching highly effective teaching practices.

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 in ELA and Math, Closely monitoring intervention programs, Stable Staff, Improved Climate, and Quality feedback to teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A continued pattern of low proficiency in reading and Math and low performance on standards checks, demonstrates a weakness in standards-based instructional practice and high yield teaching strategies.
Measurable Outcome:	If Fessenden implements a quality standards based instructional plan using high yield teaching strategies and ongoing data analysis, student achievement will rise. ELA K iReady 90%+ < 5% in Red 1 iReady 75% < 5% in Red 2 iReady 60% < 5% in Red 3-5 FSA 40% Prof 60% Gains 65% LQ gains Math K iReady < 5% in Red 1 iReady < 5% in Red 2 iReady < 5% in Red 3-5 FSA 40% Prof 60% Gains 65% LQ Gains Science 5 FSA 50%
Monitoring:	Data will be monitored weekly with all assessments. Identification of tier 2 lower quartile students, as well as identified ESSA groups of black and students with disabilities will be specifically analyzed as well. Data meetings held on each assessment to compare to target goals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning to include Professional Development on a High Yield Teaching Strategy (.51 Efffect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) quarterly. PD on strategy, modeling by coaches, observations and feedback by admin team, observations by peers with PLC discussions and analysis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our work with Ro Educational Leadership has evolved over three years from understanding of standards, aligning materials, providing quality feedback, creating standards checks, to now focusing on the practices of our teachers and their lack of knowledge on high yield strategies. Our proficiency is growing, but we still have a significant gap from district and state averages.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop calendar and PD Plan for collaborative planning sessions on High yield strategies

Person Responsible	Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)

Carry out collaborative planning sessions and facilitate learning, peer observations and feedback

Both Coaches will do

Person Responsible	Mary Slagle (mary.slagle@marion.k12.fl.us)

Oversee process and do observations with quality feedback of teachers

K-2 Redd and 3-5 Woods

Person Responsible Shawn Woods (shawn.woods@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor all school wide data pieces including close monitoring of all subgroups

Person Responsible Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have had success with establishing a culture of high expectations and had reductions of all discipline data. We want to continue this focus as we know it will assist us in our raising of academic performance.

Measurable Outcome:	If all stakeholders establish and enforce school-wide expectations and behaviors, then students will have the capacity and engagement to learn as measured by I-ready diagnostic.
Monitoring:	PBIS Team will monitor data monthly and develop proactive responses to improve end of year outcome. Counselors and social workers will work with the dean to review students weekly, refine groups, and establish systems of support for all students who show a need. The Home School Liaison will work with this team as well to make contact with families and offer supports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jasmine Jackson (jasmine.jackson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Develop high expectations for each student (1.44 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) referring to students' expectations for and beliefs in themselves and providing them the opportunity to predict their outcome based on performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Has been very effective in the past on reducing all discipline data including out of school suspensions .

Action Steps to Implement	

PBIS Team fully trained on PBIS

Person Responsible	Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)

PBIS Committee made up of instructional and non instructional members from across the school

Person Responsible	Jasmine Jackson (jasmine.jackson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monthly meetings scheduled to review data, goals, and progress

Person Responsible	Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)

Oversea monthly meetings, events, information out to staff, all data collection and review. Report out to admin on progress monthly.

Person Responsible	Jasmine Jackson (jasmine.jackson@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We continue to need parents as partners, as we have had limited parent engagement in face to face training opportunities .
Measurable Outcome:	If Fessenden Elementary school provides authentic literacy and math strategies that parents can use at home with their children, then reading and math proficiency rates will increase as measured by IReady and FSA. ELA K iReady 90%+ < 5% in Red 1 iReady 75% < 5% in Red 2 iReady 60% < 5% in Red 3-5 FSA 40% Prof 60% Gains 65% LQ gains Math K iReady < 5% in Red 1 iReady < 5% in Red 2 iReady < 5% in Red 3-5 FSA 40% Prof 60% Gains 65% LQ Gains
Monitoring:	A data analysis protocol will be used after each I Ready diagnostic as well as I ready growth monitoring point. With specific attention to at risk groups and ESSA identified groups. Each teacher will develop individual plans for students not showing growth and plans developed to determine root cause.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher-student relationships (.72 Effect Size on Hatties Index of Teaching) building relationships, efficacy, respect by the teacher for what the student brings to class (from home, culture, and peers), and recognition of the life of the student. Literacy and Mathematics trainings will be provided for all parents, including digitally, in order to give parents strategies to improve their students performance on I ready and FSA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Having parents as partners, extending the learning opportunities and helping to develop the strongest students we can will improve student achievement and success.

Action Steps to Implement	
Calendar created of parent engagement events including completing a title 1 budget to support	
Person Responsible	Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)
Parent Engagement activities planned and prepared for, carried out, both in person if allowed and digitally to allow all access at a variety of times	
Person Responsible	Moneshia Stokes (moneshia.stokes@marion.k12.fl.us)
End of event surveys reviewed and suggestions put into place to improve the events	

Person Responsible   Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@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.

1.0 incidents per 100. Violent incidents we are high, very low property incidents and drug incidents. Out of school suspensions are lower than in the last 3 years as well as in school suspensions. PBIS is implemented and being successful.

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.

Administrative team plans events, recognitions, and strategies to improve staff morale. Included holding a two day conference before school started where business partners provided meals and gifts to all in attendance. Team Building activities done monthly and team leaders trained on supporting a positive culture on their team. Social events planned by the Sunshine Committee each quarter that allows for staff to socialize outside the school. Stakeholders in the school provided opportunities for feedback on improvement and student success including PTO and SAC. Principal Redd very involved in the community connects the school with business partners and sponsors.

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

Principal Redd leads her leadership team in planning these activities. Sunshine committee made up of staff from across the campus plans quarterly events.

Business partners include the Sunset Ocala Rotary Club and All State Construction.

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: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00