

Marion County Public Schools

Harbour View 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

Harbour View Elementary School

8445 SE 147TH PL, Summerfield, FL 34491

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Joy Baxley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2021

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* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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

Harbour View Elementary School

8445 SE 147TH PL, Summerfield, FL 34491

[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	44%

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.

Our mission at Harbour View Elementary is to create an innovative environment where All children, regardless of differences, will excel. We are dedicated to excellence in education so that each child will become a productive citizen in an ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are dedicated to excellence in education so that each child will become a productive citizen in an ever-changing world.

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
Hensel, Rob	Principal	The principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. He provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, models the problem solving process, supervises the development of a strong infrastructure, conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation, provides adequate professional learning opportunities, develops a culture of expectation with the school staff, ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need, and communicates with parents as necessary.
Pollard, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Light, Vera	School Counselor	The guidance counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data. She facilitates development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation, assists with professional development for behavior concerns, and assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Nettles-Brown, Jannissa	Dean	Our dean will model and teach school wide expectations for our students and support teachers with implementing their classroom expectations. Our dean will focus on building relationships with students in order to help them create educational plans that ensure improved academic success. Our dean will also provide strategies and resources so our faculty and staff can also build successful relationships with our students.
Salem, Sheri	Math Coach	The content area specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida standards for math and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Swinehart, Charolette	Reading Coach	The content area specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida standards for language arts and Writing and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/14/2021, Joy Baxley

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.*

3

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

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

700

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

15

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

7

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	126	120	120	111	123	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	738
Attendance below 90 percent	63	62	52	66	63	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
One or more suspensions	8	6	7	5	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA	19	17	50	34	16	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
Course failure in Math	13	15	49	40	13	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	8	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	19	21	55	48	26	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	118	121	114	135	135	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	63	36	47	56	55	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	302
One or more suspensions	3	7	7	10	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	3	7	38	16	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Course failure in Math	2	7	26	15	27	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	37	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	42	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
	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	8	12	30	15	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	118	121	114	135	135	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	63	36	47	56	55	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	302
One or more suspensions	3	7	7	10	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	3	7	38	16	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Course failure in Math	2	7	26	15	27	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	37	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	42	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
	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	8	12	30	15	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	23	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	

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				43%	47%	57%	42%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	56%	58%	43%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	52%	53%	48%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				46%	51%	63%	51%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	58%	62%	54%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	49%	51%	40%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	47%	53%	65%	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	38%	44%	-6%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	42%	49%	-7%	62%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	45%	6%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	44%	7%	53%	-2%
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				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11 / 11%	15 / 14%	30 / 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 10%	12 / 14%	22 / 25%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	3 / 19%	5 / 31%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6 / 6%	7 / 6%	36 / 32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 5%	3 / 3%	26 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	3 / 19%	8 / 50%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17 / 16%	24 / 21%	34 / 30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 12%	11 / 15%	15 / 21%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 5%	2 / 10%	2 / 11%
	English Language Learners	2 / 11%	1 / 5%	1 / 5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13 / 12%	16 / 14%	41 / 37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 12%	7 / 10%	22 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 5%	1 / 5%	4 / 21%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20 / 20%	15 / 15%	22 / 21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13 / 19%	8 / 12%	14 / 21%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 12%	2 / 8%	3 / 12%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 7%	1 / 6%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6 / 6%	9 / 9%	17 / 17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 6%	6 / 9%	9 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 4%	1 / 4%	4 / 16%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25 / 23%	17 / 15%	28 / 25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17 / 20%	11 / 13%	17 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 5%	3 / 14%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13 / 12%	15 / 13%	27 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 8%	9 / 10%	19 / 22%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 5T	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / %	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31 / 25%	19 / 14R	25 / 19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13 / 16%	7 / 8%	11 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 5%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20 / 16%	13 / 10%	42 / 32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 10%	5 / 6%	22 / 26%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 5%	1 / 5%	2 / 9%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	81 / 699%	70 / 56%	65 / 54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43 / 59%	37 / 47%	35 / 46%
	Students With Disabilities	6 / 32%	4 / 21%	3 / 16%
	English Language Learners	2 / 67%	1 / 33%	1 / 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	36	47	24	63	64	10				
ELL	23	67		27	67		20				
BLK	28	45		28	50		30				
HSP	35	64		36	70		39				
MUL	29			47							
WHT	42	51	47	47	72	63	55				
FRL	29	42	43	34	66	65	39				
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	19	30	28	27	43	42	22				
ELL	25	30	9	32	41	38	36				
BLK	34	47		35	53		20				
HSP	40	41	26	41	48	41	45				
MUL	40	56		46	33		40				
WHT	45	58	48	50	53	47	59				
FRL	37	50	42	40	49	46	43				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	40	52	25	36	30	18				
ELL	20	41	39	41	43	35	31				
BLK	29	28		43	47		50				
HSP	35	41	45	48	49	33	63				
MUL	38	33		52	53						
WHT	46	46	58	53	58	41	71				
FRL	37	44	54	47	52	43	64				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	44
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	36
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	51
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	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
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	54
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	47
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?

Based on proficiency data in ELA for the 2020-21 school year, we are showing a decreasing trend in 3rd grade proficiency of 10% from 41% to 31%. We are showing a decreasing trend in 4th grade proficiency of 2% from 40% to 38%. And in 5th grade our ELA proficiency has remained steady at 43% for all three years.

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

There were significant deficits in four different subgroups in the area of ELA learning gains in the bottom quartile. Four different subgroups also saw significant decreases in their science achievement as well.

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

We did not have our tasks aligned to the standards being taught in ELA and science. We need to plan tasks that are aligned to and at the appropriate rigor for the standards. We then have to monitor and give constructive feedback to align ourselves. Also we need to know who our bottom quartile students are in ELA and differentiate our lessons in order to improve their ELA abilities.

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

Our Black students showed a 19% increase in their ELA learning gains. Our multiracial students saw a 23% increase in the ELA learning gains.

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

We targeted our bottom quartile students and provided intensive reading instruction for 30 minutes each day in their MTSS block. We taught them reading skills they needed to improve their overall proficiency. For the first time, students (K-5) were allowed to transition to other classrooms in order to receive their reading intervention.

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

During PLCs, we will plan for acceleration lessons for each standard. This will be part of the differentiation planning: how do we help those students who are not successful and how do we help those students who have mastered the standard?

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 and staff would need to be trained in differentiation strategies and concepts. Teachers will be trained on how to analyze data gathered from formative assessments.

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

Administration will conduct fidelity checks of MTSS groups and tasks aligned to the standards. Teachers and administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs in order to calibrate on task alignment to standards. Teachers will also bring in lessons, resources, and student work samples to PLC meetings in order to work on differentiating their lessons to meet all of our students' needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELL, SWD, and African-American subgroups are not performing on grade level and are not meeting the ESSA requirements.
Measurable Outcome:	ELL, SWD, and African-American subgroups will increase their proficiency in reading and math to 41% in both areas as based on the FSA state assessments for the 2022 school year. African-American students will increase their ELA proficiency by 7 percent from 34% to 41% and their math proficiency by 6 percent from 35% to 41%. ELL students will increase their ELA proficiency by 16 percent from 25% to 41% and their math proficiency by 9 percent from 32% to 41%. Students with disabilities will increase their ELA proficiency by 22 percent from 19% to 41% and their math proficiency by 14 percent from 27% to 41%.
Monitoring:	Administration and teachers will monitor our subgroups' success using i-Ready and QSMA data throughout the school year. We will reteach non-proficient skills, tutor, and/or provide extra time during the school day for these students in order for them to show proficiency on their standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing student learning strategies and opportunities to practice provides a .62 effect size (Hattie). Students will receive learning benefits and show improvement from differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will collaboratively plan twice per week in PLCs. During these meetings, they will develop lessons to meet the needs of our students who are non-proficient on the standards. We will also review data and plan reteach lessons for standards that are not being mastered as measured by i-Ready and QSMA.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will receive differentiation training during pre-planning week and throughout the year during PLCs.

Person Responsible Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will be trained on effective ELL strategies on September 22nd (early release day) by Yvette Del Nodal.

Person Responsible Jennifer Pollard (jennifer.pollard@marion.k12.fl.us)

During PLCs, teachers will analyze data to create groups in order to reteach standards to mastery as well as accelerate students who have mastered the standard.

Person Responsible Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our 2021 ELA progress monitoring data shows the following percentages of grades K-2 students who are not on track to secure a level 3 are: 88% of Kindergarten, 16% of 1st grade, 58% of 2nd grade. Our 2021 ELA FSA data shows the following percentages of grades 3-5 students who scored below a level 3: 69% of 3rd grade, 62% of 4th grade, 57% of 5th grade.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading End of Year Placement 75% of kindergarten, 50% of 1st grade, and 55% of 2nd grade students will be proficient. On the 2022 ELA FSA, 40% of 3rd grade, 42% of 4th grade, and 47% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher.
Monitoring:	In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress: 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 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. During classroom walk throughs levels of student engagement will be noted by administration and feedback will be provide to teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Scaffolding: Teachers build support for students in learning and gradually take away supports as needed. Teachers model, offer feedback and coaching as students are learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "scaffolding has a 0.82 effect size". Typically, the four steps include: I do, We do, You do together, and then You do alone. This scaffolds the learning process and supports students through guided practice.

Action Steps to Implement

K-5 teachers will collaborate each week to plan phonics and vocabulary instruction and use of scaffolding reading strategies within the ELA block. Teachers should show evidence of scaffolding at the beginning of a learning task and as needed when students need support. Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure that ELA instruction is consistently administered with fidelity.

Person Responsible Charolette Swinehart (charolette.swinehart@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.

Harbour View Elementary School is implementing PBIS this school year. This program is research based and proven to promote a positive school culture and environment. Teachers, staff, and students are part of this program and will help develop our school's goals. We also have a new social emotional curriculum (Caring School Community) which will also lend itself to promoting a positive school culture and environment. Students will feel safe and supported through these programs along with our teachers and staff providing them with a caring and supportive environment.

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

Harbour View Elementary School involves parents through conferences both face to face and over the phone. Grade level and subject area parent events/training are provided throughout the school year. Based on feedback from parents, these events have been scheduled mainly in the afternoons. Classrooms have been opened to parent volunteers. Parents and family members have been encouraged to become approved volunteers so they will have an opportunity to become comfortable with and interact with the school setting on a first hand basis. Tutors for Kids and The Villages Rotary Evening Club have committed to volunteering and mentoring our students. The Villages Rotary Evening Club has committed to have a member on our SAC. Village View Church gives our students supplies and hosts an after school club for them as well. Village View also beautifies our school throughout the year via service projects. We are also in the process of securing a business partner who also wishes to volunteer in our classrooms.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00