

Marion County Public Schools

Maplewood Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Maplewood Elementary School

4751 SE 24TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christine Carter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	99%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Maplewood Elementary School

4751 SE 24TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[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	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

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.

Maplewood is a school where all children can learn and develop to their fullest potential. Each student's success is based upon the school, home, and community working side by side to ensure that each child will become a life-long learner and develop a sense of self worth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Side By Side For Success

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
DiSanza, Christine	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 to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The principal supervises all administrative, instructional, and non-Instructional personnel assigned to the school.
Martin, James	Assistant Principal	Mr. Martin is responsible for curriculum and distributing resources to teachers. He also assists with professional development of teachers and paraprofessionals. He is the assessment coordinator for state testing (FSA).
Guynn, Shay	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Guynn is responsible for curriculum and distributing resources to teachers. She also assists with professional development of teachers and paraprofessionals. She is the assessment coordinator for state testing (FSAA).
Hodges, Phyllis	Math Coach	Mrs. Hodges serves as an instructional coach for teachers, assisting with math and science instruction. She is available to model lessons for teachers, co-teach, provide center ideas, support with lesson planning, and help disaggregate data to further guide instruction.
Hipke, Beth	Reading Coach	Mrs. Hipke serves as an instructional coach for teachers, assisting with ELA instruction. She is available to model lessons for teachers, co-teach, provide center ideas, support with lesson planning, and help disaggregate data to further guide instruction.
Gravel, Rebecca	School Counselor	Ms. Gravel is a counselor for our Kindergarten, second, fourth, and self contained classes of modified curriculum. She is available to provide academic and emotional support to students, teachers, and families. She supports our social-emotional curriculum by modeling lessons in the classroom and counsels students on good character.
Hilton, Kelly	School Counselor	Ms. Hilton is a counselor for our first, third, fifth, and self contained classes of the general curriculum. She is available to provide academic and emotional support to students, teachers, and families. She supports our social-emotional curriculum by modeling lessons in the classroom and counsels students on good character.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Christine Carter

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.*

4

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

Total number of students enrolled at the school

795

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

5

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

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	112	126	129	102	123	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	721
Attendance below 90 percent	24	43	34	32	35	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	2	1	10	5	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	27	24	40	11	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	29	23	38	12	27	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	11	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	30	29	38	18	25	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175

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	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	74	116	119	97	128	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	22	59	58	43	57	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	302
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	15	15	26	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	1	15	15	25	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
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	1	12	14	16	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	74	116	119	97	128	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	22	59	58	43	57	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	302
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	15	15	26	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	1	15	15	25	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
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	1	12	14	16	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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				46%	47%	57%	46%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	56%	58%	47%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	52%	53%	37%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	51%	63%	54%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	58%	62%	51%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	49%	51%	36%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	47%	53%	47%	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	41%	44%	-3%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	45%	9%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	45%	9%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	56%	44%	12%	53%	3%
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: iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Mathematics, Grades 1-5: iReady 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	17 / 15%	22 / 19%	54 / 49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 15%	11 / 16%	28 / 44%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 8%	3 / 12%	6 / 29%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10 / 9%	16 / 14%	44 / 40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 8%	7 / 10%	22 / 34%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 8%	2 / 8%	8 / 36%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27 / 24%	31 / 26%	45 / 37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 15%	9 / 16%	16 / 28%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 13%	3 / 10%	4 / 13%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11 / 10%	8 / 7%	31 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 / 4%	2 / 4%	7 / 12%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32 / 36%	23 / 25%	34 / 38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22 / 39%	14 / 25%	22 / 39%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	2 / 40%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10 / 11%	5 / 6%	29 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 12%	4 / 7%	17 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 7%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34 / 31%	25 / 23%	30 / 28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 / 23%	7 / 13%	12 / 23%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 7%	2 / 7%	1 / 4%
	English Language Learners	1 / 50%	1 / 100%	1 / 100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17 / 15%	19 / 17%	47 / 44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 9%	6 / 11%	15 / 29%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 3%	0 / 0%	6 / 25%
	English Language Learners	1 / 50%	1 / 100%	1 / 100%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44 / 38%	22 / 19%	31 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17 / 30%	8 / 14%	9 / 15%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 8%	2 / 8%	2 / 8%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33 / 29%	20 / 17%	41 / 35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 25%	6 / 10%	15 / 25%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 4%	1 / 4%	2 / 8%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61 / 54%	55 / 47%	48 / 42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27 / 48%	21 / 36%	17 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 13%	5 / 20%	4 / 17%
	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	19	26	32	33	34	32	25				
ELL	53			50							
BLK	29	41	30	45	35	36	19				
HSP	48	50		55	65		45				
MUL	77			62							
WHT	51	65	50	73	60	29	59				
FRL	43	43	33	56	52	50	36				
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	18	51	46	26	36	14	22				
ELL	41	82		59	45						
BLK	29	59	60	41	57	41	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
HSP	40	78		45	33		50				
MUL	50	64		59	71						
WHT	52	57	39	60	56	18	62				
FRL	35	52	50	41	49	34	30				
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	22	25	24	34	31	17				
ELL	25			42							
BLK	27	36	29	35	45	40	20				
HSP	43	45		37	28		48				
MUL	52	46		62	62						
WHT	51	50	50	63	57	32	55				
FRL	37	42	33	45	47	42	36				

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	52
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	416
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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	53
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	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
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	45
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?

Students with disabilities score significantly lower than their non-disabled peers and are not making adequate learning gains. 39% of students with disabilities made learning gains as compared with the school's overall average of 56% of all students in ELA, and 38% of students with disabilities made learning gains in math as compared with the school's overall average of 56% of all students. Additionally, students are not making adequate progress or gains in ELA school-wide.

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

School-wide data reflects the need for focused standards-based instruction in each grade level in ELA. Third, fourth, and fifth grade proficiencies are below the state average based on FSA testing. Third grade proficiency is 45% compared to the state average of 54%. Fourth grade ELA proficiency is 47% compared to the state average of 52%. Fifth grade proficiency in ELA is 50% compared to the state average of 54%.

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

Students are not reaching grade level proficiency because they are lacking mastery of prerequisite skills. Teachers will need to focus on remediating students by focusing on important prerequisite skills required to attain grade level mastery. Strategic planning will be important as teachers will need to focus on planning instruction on current grade level standards while continuing to fill gaps in knowledge and skills that are not yet mastered. Strategic planning will take place twice a week during collaborative planning.

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

Based on 2021 FSA data, students made the biggest improvement in math achievement. School-wide proficiency went from 55% in 2019 to 64% in 2021. Based on progress monitoring data from 2020, students scored higher in math than ELA.

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

Maplewood began focusing on small group instruction school-wide to ensure that students were receiving individualized instruction on grade level standards while assessing the need for remediation. Small groups allow teachers to progress monitor students individually and prescribe a plan of action to accelerate learning.

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

Maplewood will continue focusing on small group instruction, and specifically focus on what tasks students are completing to show mastery of standards.

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.

Teachers will participate in two days of collaborative planning each week. The first day will focus on rigorous tier I instruction. The second day will focus on tier 2 remediation and acceleration of learning for all students. During collaborative planning, teacher needs will be assessed and professional development will be differentiated and provided as needed. Examples of professional development will include planning for effective small group instruction, using standards and test item specifications to plan for mastery, and training on effective center grouping and center activities.

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 meet bi-weekly to evaluate the effectiveness of collaborative planning and determine if the professional development provided to teachers is being implemented effectively. This will be measured by visiting classrooms, observing instruction, and analyzing student mastery of standards and tracking data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Progress monitoring of iReady data indicates that only 20% of kindergarten students, 14% of first grade students, 25% of second grade students, and 36% of third grade students are on track to be considered proficient. Learning gains in ELA have dropped school-wide based on 2021 FSA data and iReady data. Implementing effective small group instruction in all classrooms will help teachers analyze student mastery on an individual level and allow teachers a better understanding of what prerequisite skills are needed to accelerate learning. If effective small group instruction is implemented school wide, then ELA learning gains should improve from 56% to 59% as measured by the 2022 FSA. Overall proficiency in ELA should increase from 45% to 48% as measured by the 2022 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	Maplewood learning gains will improve from 56% to 59% in ELA as measured by the 2022 FSA. Maplewood's ELA proficiency will increase from 45% to 48% as measured by the 2022 FSA. Additionally, each grade level should show growth on iReady during diagnostic period 3. Kindergarten students should increase from 20%-23%, first grade students should increase from 14%- 17%, and second grade students should increase from 25%-28% as measured by the iReady student diagnostic assessment.
Monitoring:	<p>The area focus of small group instruction in ELA focused on literacy standards will be monitored throughout the year by classroom walkthroughs to determine the rigor of instruction and guide professional development. Hattie's Index of teaching of Direct Instruction with an effect size of .59 will ensure that the teacher specifies learning outcomes, the teacher knows and communicates success criteria, builds commitment and engagement in learning, designs the lesson with a check for understanding, guided practice, closure and independent practice in the small group instruction. Additionally, student data will be analyzed weekly during collaborative planning to determine interventions, acceleration, and remediation. MTSS will be used to scaffold learning and document progress. Also, student progress monitoring meetings will be scheduled regularly to address individual student needs. In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:</p> <p>K-5: iReady Diagnostic AP1 August 2021, AP2 January 2022, and AP3 May 2022 K-5: iReady Growth Monitoring November 2021 and March 2022 3-5: District QSMAs Q1 October 2021, Q2 December 2021, Q3 March 2022</p> <p>Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction focused on grade level standards will result in student achievement. This year, we will focus on student task alignment to the standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction allows teachers to work one on one or in small groups with students that have similar needs. Instruction can be tailored to remediate students as needed while monitoring mastery of current standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development will be provided on effective small group instruction. Collaborative planning will focus on ELA direct instruction and planning for instructional tasks aligned with standards. Progress will be

monitored through classroom walk throughs, and constructive feedback to ensure the reading block is being implemented appropriately with fidelity.

Person Responsible Beth Hipke (beth.hipke@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students with disabilities will participate in intensive small group instruction as well as an appropriate intervention that matches their deficiency and is delivered by a certified teacher. This subgroup will be monitored throughout the year to determine the effectiveness of the intervention and track progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

Student assessment data will be used to determine effectiveness of professional development and small group instruction implementation.

Person Responsible Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on input from parent surveys, parents would like more information on assisting their students with academics at home.

Measurable Outcome: Maplewood will involve parents in their child's education, and will give parents resources and strategies to help their students at home which will increase proficiency in both ELA and math by 3%. Proficiency will increase from 48%- 51% in ELA and 64 to 67% in math as measured by the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: Effectiveness of parent trainings will be monitored through parent surveys and conversations with stakeholders. Student data will be monitored to track the academic progress of students and evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Family engagement and involvement events will be planned to teach families ways to assist students with academics at home.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Parent Involvement is crucial for student success. Engaging families in academics and building a home-school relationship is key to student success.

Action Steps to Implement

Based on parent survey feedback, family engagement and involvement activities will be planned based on family needs. These events will be offered both face to face and virtually and will be advertised through notes home, the school marquee, Skylert messages and newsletters.

Person Responsible Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

Maplewood focuses on building a positive school culture for all staff, students, and stakeholders. Staff, student, and stakeholder input is solicited when making decisions. Students are celebrated for academic performance, good citizenship, setting and meeting individual goals, and doing their personal best. The school emphasizes the importance of the home-school relationship and ensures that families feel connected and have a say in their child's education. This is done through weekly call-outs by the principal, personal phone calls home from teachers and guidance counselors, newsletters, and face to face meetings. Administration partners with teachers each week and participates in planning. This is so teachers can ask questions, share concerns, offer ideas and add input to school planning.

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

Administration, teachers, and students are stakeholders who analyze school data and set goals for academic and behavior achievement. The PTO at Maplewood is effective at promoting both fun and educational activities the school has planned. The PTO does many things for students and teachers alike, such as planning special events, fundraisers, and festivals. The PTO also provides treats for students and staff throughout the year during holidays and special times such as Teacher Appreciation Week. This boosts morale throughout the school. The SAC also consists of school staff, community members, and families. The SAC gives input on the school improvement plan, budget, and also shares ideas on how to improve day to day functions at the school.

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: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00