

Marion County Public Schools

# Wyomina Park Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Wyomina Park Elementary School

511 NE 12TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34470

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Victoria Hunt

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: F (31%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

## Wyomina Park Elementary School

511 NE 12TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34470

[ 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	70%

### 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.**

To  
Learn and lead by  
Empowering all stakeholders to  
Access the skills required to fully  
Develop as successful citizens.

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

Learn and lead to succeed.

### 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
Baxley, Joy	Principal	Lead school, designate resources, evaluate and place personnel, purchase materials, manage budgets, INCREASE student proficiency in ELA and Math and Science, make decisions, plans and implement programs, monitor progress, delegate responsibilities, communicate with and involve stakeholders
Eatmon, Susan	Assistant Principal	Distribute resources, evaluate personnel, lead collaborative planning, INCREASE student proficiency in ELA and Math and Science, make decisions, plan and implement programs, monitor progress, delegate responsibilities, plan master schedule, organize and deliver state testing with fidelity
Greenbaum, Howard	Assistant Principal	Distribute resources, evaluate personnel, lead collaborative planning, INCREASE student proficiency in ELA and Math and Science, make decisions, plan and implement programs, monitor progress, delegate responsibilities, organize testing, schedule students
Macias, Lisa	Dean	Roll out PBIS program, determine resources, discipline progression, deliver/supervise small group interventions for behavior, address T2 and T3 student needs, process referrals, determine consequences, communicate with parents and teachers, support teachers with discipline strategies that work, assist with threat assessments and MDT team.
Hamilton, Brandy	Reading Coach	Coach teachers, provide ELA resources, lead collaborative planning, work with small groups of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, assist with 3rd grade portfolio, intervention screenings, training, and resource distribution.
Von Ohlen, Nancy	Math Coach	Coach teachers, provide math resources, lead collaborative planning, work with small groups of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, provide teacher training
Hughes, Jolene	Administrative Support	Manage budget and finances, support Principal, assist teachers, obtain substitutes, provide substitutes with keys, plans and a map
Camp, Kacey	School Counselor	Counsel students, assist with threat assessments, lead MDT team, attend IEP and 504 meetings, communicate with parents and students, conduct small groups

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/31/2017, Victoria Hunt



**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.*

2

**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**

38

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

591

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

3

**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	117	101	91	97	88	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	52	44	34	41	34	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
One or more suspensions	15	14	15	29	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Course failure in ELA	29	31	31	37	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
Course failure in Math	29	38	25	36	25	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
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	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	16	27	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

**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	34	40	37	53	38	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	233

**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	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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 7/21/2021

## 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	99	90	85	90	60	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	23	22	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	4	7	2	11	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	11	18	14	13	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	11	18	14	13	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

## 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	99	90	85	90	60	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	23	22	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	4	7	2	11	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	
Course failure in ELA	11	18	14	13	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in Math	11	18	14	13	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

#### 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	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	

## 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%	34%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	56%	58%	54%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	52%	53%	50%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				32%	51%	63%	40%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	58%	62%	50%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	49%	51%	34%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				42%	47%	53%	36%	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	21%	44%	-23%	58%	-37%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	49%	-13%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	24%	49%	-25%	62%	-38%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	64%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	45%	-6%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	38%	44%	-6%	53%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

Elementary:

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	11/13	7/8	18/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/11	6/8	14/18
	Students With Disabilities	2/18	0/0	1/7
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9/11	4/5	17/19
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/9	2/3	14/18
	Students With Disabilities	2/18	0/0	1/7
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11/13	18/20	28/31
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/8	12/15	20/26
	Students With Disabilities	1/5	4/15	3/12
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/5	7/8	14/16
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/4	6/8	11/14
	Students With Disabilities	1/5	1/4	2/8
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20/22	14/15	18/19
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/20	10/13	14/17
	Students With Disabilities	1/6	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/13	1/11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/3	3/3	11/12
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/4	3/4	9/11
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/13	1/11
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/9	8/9	14/16
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/10	8/10	12/15
	Students With Disabilities	1/5	2/10	2/10
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/8	4/5	16/19
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/7	3/4	13/17
	Students With Disabilities	2/11	1/5	2/10
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17/26	8/12	8/12
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/21	5/9	3/5
	Students With Disabilities	3/20	3/19	1/6
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/12	3/4	13/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/10	0/0	7/13
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/13
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30/46	24/35	21/32
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/37	15/28	12/23
	Students With Disabilities	4/29	4/27	3/20
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

## Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	63		13	18		27				
ELL	16			30							
BLK	17	50	70	20	36		10				
HSP	20	40		24	50						
MUL	33			27							
WHT	40	63		44	58		55				
FRL	23	52	73	24	45	40	21				
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	7	32	15	3	64	67	10				
ELL	6	31		6	68	80					
BLK	30	53	56	26	55	60	40				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	23	39		29	67	67	42				
MUL	43			36							
WHT	41	48	30	38	56		47				
FRL	30	44	41	28	57	56	37				
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	43	33	23	29	9	50				
ELL	11	50		6	40						
BLK	20	46	56	30	42	24	12				
HSP	34	49	36	34	56	36	39				
MUL	17	50		11	14		20				
WHT	48	67		58	63		64				
FRL	31	50	47	36	48	35	32				

### ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	29
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	34
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	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	30
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	52
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	39
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?

Our data at all grades shows that ELA proficiency for economically disadvantaged (17%) is only a very minor disadvantage at Wyomina (19%), while comparisons to students with disabilities (10%) show a much broader gap. The same is true with regards to Math proficiency, except the percentages are considerably lower, with all students being 8% proficient, and economically disadvantaged 7%, but SWD at 4% proficiency. Our percentage of proficient students is abysmally low across the board based on FSA results; this trend continues for a 4th year. Regardless of grade level or subject, data for AP2 seems to remain stagnant or even drop, but all grade levels and subjects increase by AP3. The only exception is 5th grade ELA, which was the lowest at the end of the year.

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

Learning gains in ELA (55%) and Math (48%), as well as learning gains for the bottom quartile (ELA 73%, Math 40%), continue to exceed proficiency, and this is not sustainable. Increasing proficiency must be our focus, and we need to do this by realigning resources to support improvement in lower grades as we work to ensure that students have the required foundational skills needed in reading and math to show proficiency on the state tests.

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

The need for improvement can be attributed to a deficiency in Tier 1 instruction. We need to continue our collaborative planning with an added focus on matching the task to the standard, and ensuring that the task is also to the rigor required by the depth of knowledge indicated in the item specifications. Furthermore, teachers need to be trained to be more diligent in tracking data for all formative assessments, and adjusting instruction for remediation and acceleration immediately as warranted.

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

Our science data for 5th grade shows the highest proficiency at 35%, but that is not an improvement over the past. We are still performing below the state average and will continue to work for greater proficiency.

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

We spent Title 1 money to purchase the services of a Science Content Area Specialist, who worked in our new science lab to support 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students in participating in hands-on experiments in a real lab setting. Third grade classes went monthly, 4th grade classes went biweekly, and 5th grade went weekly. The CAS modelled for the teachers and provided all materials. In addition, we focused on STEAM Showcase participation and monitored experiment proposals to ensure that they met the criteria for an experiment and not a demonstration. Also, teachers in 3rd and 4th grade put a strong emphasis on the science standards they know will be tested in 5th grade, and work hard to ensure mastery of those. Our data at the beginning of the year assessment shows that they are quite successful with this.

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

Our collaborative planning process is being revised to focus on previewing all standards at the beginning of each quarter, and meeting twice a week, instead of weekly. Regular collaborative cycles will be completed with the support of administration and CASs to support proper pacing as well as improve instructional delivery strategies. The last phase of each cycle is focused on using the data to accelerate learning.

### **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.**

Initial professional development will be based on a needs survey from last year which requested training in improving student engagement, and math strategies. We will also retrain on the collaborative planning cycle with more emphasis on pre-planning at the beginning of each quarter, data review at the end of each quarter, and moving through the phases of the cycle. Additional professional development will be determined by needs that surface through the process, as we train teachers to implement the strategies determined in the planning process.

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

We are doubling the amount of time spent in collaborative planning, as well as adding science into the mix. We will also be pre-planning at the beginning of each quarter, and focusing on a pacing guide that will vary the time spent on a standard based on the level of difficulty, rather than allowing teachers to plan for a standard each week, which might involve more or less time than required.

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

### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

We continue to have a large number of students who are not proficient, those who are about one year below grade level, and those who are two or more grade levels below. In order to meet the need of all students and continue to increase proficiency in all areas, we must deliver grade level standards-aligned instruction as well as accelerate those who are behind. The only way to accomplish this is through purposeful collaborative planning and strategic delivery of differentiated instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:**

If we plan and deliver grade level differentiated standards based instruction with task alignment, and adjust instruction based on the data to accelerate learning, then we will see an increase of at least 3 percentage points in proficiency in Reading, from 27 to 30%, in Math from 29 to 32% and in Science from 35 to 40% as measured on FSA .

**Monitoring:**

We will monitor through formative assessment results, collaborative planning, teacher use of planned strategies, QSMA data, classroom walkthroughs and observations, as well as during instructional rounds. Our data review meetings on Oct.11, Dec. 15, and March 21, will show what progress we are making on our QSMAs and other standards mastery assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

We will focus on direct instruction, in order to improve Tier 1 - this includes specific learning outcomes, with known and communicated criteria for success, using rigorous, standards aligned tasks. Teachers will be guided in collaborative planning to design lesson delivery through modelling and guided practice, and after checking for understanding, a move to independent practice. Continued use of the Standards Focus boards will support this practice.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

This strategy is one of Hattie's high effect size strategies, with evidence to say there is a .59 effect, thus impacting student achievement. Studies show that the effects are similar for general and special education students, so this will also impact our SWD subgroup.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Schedule and support quarterly pre-planning sessions to review and code Curriculum maps prior to each quarter. Teachers will work on pacing according to level of difficulty of the standards, rather than weekly standards, which is their current practice.

**Person Responsible**

Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Schedule and support weekly collaborative planning for grades K-5, initially implementing three phases - data review of prior standards, review and pre-plan standards, and analyze resources and determine pacing. Later, add implementation of phases 4 and 5, with instructional delivery strategies and then planning for review, intervention and acceleration. Instructional rounds will provide evidence of this planning, as well as the success of delivery

**Person Responsible**

Susan Eatmon (susan.eatmon@marion.k12.fl.us)

Schedule and support Response to Student Data sessions at the end of each quarter to analyze data from standards based assessments and plan for improvement. Cohort data will improve, as teachers are

provided with their prior FSA test results, and the test results of their current students to show areas of strength and need so that they may adjust instruction.

**Person**  
**Responsible** Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** While our overall number of office discipline referrals has decreased this year from last year, we have a high rate of suspensions, and more Level 1 and 3 referrals than previously. We have trained a team in PBIS, and plan to do a refresh at the beginning of the year, with a focus on school wide expectations and the repeated practicing of procedures that will help students make good choices so they can succeed academically.

**Measurable Outcome:** If we roll out an effective PBIS reboot and focus on school wide expectations, we will continue to reduce our discipline referrals, especially those that result in out of school suspensions, so that at least 80% of our population has only 0 or 1 referral, and at least 90% are never suspended.

**Monitoring:** Student Services Manager will provide regular discipline data to the administrative team for analysis. Data will be shared with staff and a plan developed to address issues with specific teachers, grade levels, or areas of the school in order to improve student behavior. Reintroduce the PBIS program with current data. Train teachers in program implementation with fidelity. Ensure that school wide expectations are displayed prominently and reviewed with school community, especially parents. Present discipline section of staff handbook and ensure that teachers understand the difference between major and minor offences and how to deal with them appropriately. Establish Character Development Academy for students to attend in lieu of out of school suspension. Support staff of Academy to instruct children in alternative behaviors which do not result in referrals. Provide space, materials, and plan for instruction for students assigned to CDA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Howard Greenbaum (howard.greenbaum@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will use the strategy of high expectations for our teachers as well as our students. The teacher expectations will be with regard to the rolling out and implementing of PBIS with fidelity, and believing in their students' ability to learn to make good choices and stay in school to learn.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Hattie's Index of Teaching shows this strategy to have a .43 effect because of the research on self-fulfilling prophecies, where people only reach the level they are expected to reach without going beyond, even if they are capable of more.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teacher-student relationships: building relationships implies agency, efficacy, respect by the teacher for what the student brings to the class (from home, culture, and peers), and recognition of the life of the student.

**Person Responsible** Howard Greenbaum (howard.greenbaum@marion.k12.fl.us)

High student expectations: students' expectations for and beliefs in themselves, involves students predicting or self-reporting their grades. Leadership notebooks will have students goal setting pieces, as well as monitoring and accountability partners.

**Person Responsible** Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Dean will send out weekly discipline reports with a different focus each week, such as grade level referrals, areas of the school where issues occur, and levels of severity of referrals. Quarterly events will be held for PBIS bucks purchase, and no referral parties.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Macias (lisa.macias@marion.k12.fl.us)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**Our discipline data for 2020-21 was 1.6 incidents per 100 students, compared to a state average of 1 incident per 100 students. However, four years ago, the school average was 10.1 incidents per 100 students, so we have made a significant reduction. We are rolling out a refreshed PBIS program and have designated personnel to run our Character Development Academy, in lieu of suspensions, where the adults will do some SEL with students and teach appropriate behaviors and responses.**

### 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 are completing our 4th and final year as a Leader in ME school, delivering the Aligning Academics training. This year brings a reboot of the Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports program, with an excellent team to lead us into doing PBIS with more fidelity.

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

Students, employees, parents, and community members are all stakeholders. If students experience a positive and supportive environment, they will want to come to school and learn, and make better behavior choices while they are here. This will ensure that student are in school, and that parents and even our neighbors are happy. As student leaders determine to make a difference in our community, they will learn not to throw trash in neighboring yards on their way home.

## 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
Total:			\$0.00