

Marion County Public Schools

Stanton Weirsdale 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School

16705 SE 134TH TER, We IR Sdale, FL 32195

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Brodie

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School

16705 SE 134TH TER, We IR Sdale, FL 32195

[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	31%

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.

We are united in challenging students to reach their fullest potential in a safe, positive, caring environment which is conducive to teaching and learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a community school for student-centered learning that provides a family-friendly environment in order to develop successful and well-rounded global leaders.

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
Brodie, Cynthia	Principal	The principal oversees the day to day operations of the school. The principal also supports teachers and staff with curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning.
Parks, Megan	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports teachers and staff with curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning.
Kelly, Tammy	School Counselor	Our school counselor supports students, parents and staff with addressing students' immediate and long-term needs (food, clothing, services, mental health, etc.).
Tucker, Doris	Dean	Our student service manager develops and supports a school-wide positive behavior system and handles student discipline. She also puts into place processes and procedures that support student safety on campus.
Alderman, Amy	Instructional Coach	Our content area specialist supports teachers and students with the delivery of ELA curriculum.
Carson, Georgiana	Instructional Coach	Our content area specialist supports teachers and students with the delivery of Math curriculum.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Cynthia Brodie

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

498

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.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	73	83	82	75	85	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	482
Attendance below 90 percent	42	34	33	34	39	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
One or more suspensions	5	7	6	15	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	12	18	29	20	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in Math	11	23	31	24	26	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	19	9	24	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	17	27	38	30	32	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180

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	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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

Thursday 8/19/2021

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	87	88	75	97	87	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518
Attendance below 90 percent	50	44	35	41	32	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226
One or more suspensions	9	5	7	8	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	5	8	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	5	8	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	12	17	17	32	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

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	2	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	87	88	75	97	87	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518	
Attendance below 90 percent	50	44	35	41	32	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	
One or more suspensions	9	5	7	8	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	
Course failure in ELA	0	5	8	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in Math	0	5	8	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	
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	12	17	17	32	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	

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	2	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
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%	43%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	56%	58%	45%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	52%	53%	31%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				46%	51%	63%	48%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	58%	62%	44%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	49%	51%	36%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				50%	47%	53%	44%	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	28%	44%	-16%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	45%	3%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	62%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	53%	44%	9%	53%	0%
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	4 / 5%	7 / 9%	22 / 28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 / 3%	5 / 8%	17 / 28%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	0 / 0%	2 / 13%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3 / 4%	9 / 11%	26 / 32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 5%	5 / 8%	19 / 31%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 13%	1 / 7%	3 / 19%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10 / 13%	10 / 12%	22 / 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 11%	8 / 12%	18 / 27%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4 / 5%	6 / 7%	13 / 16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 6%	6 / 9%	11 / 16%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20 / 29%	13 / 18%	16 / 21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13 / 24%	7 / 12%	11 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	1 / 7%	3 / 19%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7 / 10%	7 / 10%	13 / 18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 7%	4 / 7%	9 / 16%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	1 / 7%	3 / 19%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13 / 17%	12 / 15%	15 / 18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 14%	8 / 15%	9 / 16%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8 / 11%	6 / 7%	18 / 21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 8%	3 / 5%	13 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	0 / 0%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17 / 22%	11 / 14%	16 / 20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 18%	9 / 14%	11 / 17%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	1 / 25%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19 / 25%	9 / 11%	22 / 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 18%	7 / 11%	15 / 23%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 13%	0 / 0%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	1 / 25%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37 / 51%	30 / 38%	25 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28 / 48%	23 / 37%	19 / 31%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 29%	3 / 18%	2 / 13%
	English Language Learners	2 / 50%	1 / 25%	1 / 25%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	10	36		12	41	54	8				
ELL	21			42							
BLK	14			31							
HSP	32	50		46	50		41				
WHT	42	59	80	46	50	70	42				
FRL	30	53	71	36	52	67	34				
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	23	38	35	30	44	44	44				
ELL	23	38		27	38						
BLK	33	40		33	30						
HSP	43	53		45	49		56				

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
MUL	60			47							
WHT	42	51	32	47	50	34	49				
FRL	38	53	36	41	45	30	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	16	41	31	29	44	32	15				
ELL	24	64		35	43						
BLK	47	50		53	58						
HSP	40	59		50	46		36				
MUL	38			46							
WHT	43	43	27	47	44	35	45				
FRL	43	44	26	48	45	37	43				

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	50
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	403
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
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	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	23
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	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students 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	56
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	49
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?

The data indicates scores on ELA proficiency continue to decrease from 2018/2019 to current 2021 from 43% to 36% overall. Math proficiency continues to decrease from 48% to 41% proficiency. Lowest quartile students are making gains in both ELA from 31% in 2018 to 67% in 2020 and Math gains from 36% to 62%.

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

Reading is an area of need when looking at our data since 2018. Each year proficiency has decreased which shows an area of improvement school-wide. Our ELA proficiency rates are not improving.

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

Tier I reading instruction and use of item specifications for planning were not being used to their full potential. Tier I instruction is lacking addressing all six areas of reading and the individual needs of students. New actions to be taken this year are focusing on strong Tier I reading instruction planning with standards alignment to item specifications in grades 3-5 and B.E.S.T. standards based planning in grades K-2. We will plan for small group instruction targeting fluency, vocabulary, phonics, and comprehension. Training will be provided on Close Reading strategies as well as guided reading school-wide. Teachers will utilize Close Reading in all grade levels to help students dissect text for better reading comprehension as students learn to read and read to learn.

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

Progress was made in ELA learning gains from 31% to 38% and Math learning gains from 44% to 49%.

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

The math instructional block was 70-75 minutes depending on grade level which allows for math intervention to be built in. The addition of Reflex Math which allowed students math fluency practice on a daily basis.

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

High order questioning and writing across all subject areas where students have to read, think, and write will help students think critically which in turn will help accelerate learning. Close reading strategies taught in reading, math, and science will be expected of students to use.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be offered during collaborative planning as teachers develop skillsets with strategies to teach the standards and address remediation on a student individual need. During collaboration strategies for vocabulary and comprehension will be focused on as well as standard aligned instruction. Teachers will work together weekly to structure their lessons utilizing the gradual release model. We will conduct learning walks in classrooms with a specific focus on Tier I reading instruction and provide feedback to teachers. We will train teachers in utilizing high order questioning strategies in weekly collaboration as they plan questions for instruction.

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

Collaboration will be targeted on the greatest impact in reading and math. The administrative team will complete weekly walkthroughs looking for trends and implementation of instruction based on collaborative planning. Walkthrough forms will be kept where leadership can assess trends by grade levels see how teachers are progressing with their skillset and provide feedback to the teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reviewing data from the last three years on our district assessments, state assessment data, and classroom assessment data it is evident we need to work on planning for Tier I reading instruction with an emphasis on Close Reading and Guided Reading practice. When students can't read on grade level it affects students' ability to learn in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Learning gains and proficiency in the area of ELA will increase by 5% on the 2022 FSA. The increased proficiency in ELA will also increase math proficiency by 3% on the 2022 FSA, and science proficiency will improve by 5% on the 2022 FCAT Science.
Monitoring:	Weekly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data (such as iReady diagnostic, iReady progress monitoring, FSA, MTSS data, etc.), will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will utilize well-planned checks for understandings and other formative assessment data to provide targeted small group instruction with administration monitoring implementation weekly. The CAS in Literacy and Math will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and check for understanding.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development on student achievement (.51 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategies). Through PLCs, collaboration meetings, and staff development opportunities teachers will learn how to increase students' vocabulary to explain their thinking and increase opportunities for students to initiate questions in class discussions. Teachers will collaboratively plan using standards-based resources and planning for high order questioning in whole group and small group instruction. Teachers will plan for Close Reading and Guided Reading with students in collaborative planning twice per week with content area specialists and administration. Teachers will increase students' opportunities for writing, class discussions, and reading through all subject areas. This strategy will be regularly monitored as teachers use checks for understanding through brief writing opportunities for students to explain their thinking and understanding in all subject areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that students who have increased opportunities for writing and reading in all areas, increase their overall abilities in all subjects. We will use ELA textbook adopted curriculum SAVVAS, iReady Reading Workbooks, and iReady Teacher Toolbox lessons, Top Score Writing curriculum, Social Studies, STEMscopes, DBQ's, interactive notebooks, differentiated instruction using check for understanding data, and multiple intervention resources to improve learning gains. In addition, research shows that planned, explicit, and rigorous tier 1 instruction, along with task alignment, increases student learning in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development will be provided to all instructional and classroom based non-instructional staff on reading strategies, programs being used in classrooms, high order questioning, vocabulary, and class discussion techniques. Professional development will be provided to all classroom based non-instructional staff on the SAVVAS reading program.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student engagement is a direct area of focus because our overall FSA ELA proficiency is 36% and Math is 41%. The SWD subgroup in 2019 was below the 41% requirement at 37% and ELL subgroup in 2019 was below the requirement at 33%. Student engagement is key to students understanding and comprehending text.
Measurable Outcome:	If student engagement practices are in alignment with standard based learning, then overall ELA proficiency will increase by 3% minimum to 39% and Math proficiency will increase by 3% minimum from 41% to 44%. The SWD subgroup target goal is 41% and ELL subgroup target goal is 41%.
Monitoring:	Professional development will be provided during weekly faculty meetings as well as through collaboration which meets twice a week for 45 minutes each with a focus on ELA and Math. Implementation of student engagement strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, ESOL para utilizing strategies when working directly with specific students, students creating goals with teachers, data chats with students and staff, parent communication and reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During collaboration, teachers with administration and Literacy and Math coach will create planned lessons for student engagement and collaborative learning. Resources will include, peer tutoring, peer conversations, Kagan Structures, and an element of teaching students to teach their parents through parent engagement events.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie of "Visible Learning" states research shows class discussion has a 0.82 high effect size and cooperative learning has a 0.55 high effect size. Students being taught the skills to collaborative work together, problem solve, and encourage one another to be engaged, is impactful and will show gains in learning. Bob Daggett research states, "In cross-age peer learning... raises academic mastery and metacognitive processes." (Peer Learner Engagement, International Center for Leadership in Education)

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will work with content area specialists, home school liaison, and teachers in creating meaningful parent events that incorporates students teaching their parents strategies/structures that can be utilized at home throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Megan Parks (megan.parks@marion.k12.fl.us)

Literacy Content Area Specialist will work with teachers in collaboration, after school, professional learning communities, etc. to provide examples and instruction on how to set up student engagement structures in the classroom. CAS will model and monitor for effectiveness.

Person Responsible Amy Alderman (amy.alderman@marion.k12.fl.us)

Math Content Area Specialist will work with teachers in collaboration, after school, professional learning communities, etc. to provide examples and instruction on how to set up student engagement structures in the classroom. CAS will model and monitor for effectiveness.

Person Responsible Georgiana Carson (georgiana.carson@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our 2021 Progress Monitoring of k-2 students reveal that 84% of students are not on track to secure a level 3 are: 88% of Kindergarten, 81% of 1st grade, and 84% of 2nd grade. Our 2021 ELA FSA data shows the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3: 64% of 3rd grade, 65% of 4th grade, and 62% of 5th grade.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2021 iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement, 12% of the kindergarten students were proficient, 10% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 15% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. On the 2022 iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement 80% of Kindergarten, 80% of 1st grade, and 80% of 2nd grade will be proficient. On the 2021 ELA FSA, 36% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 35% of our 4th grade students scored a 3 or higher, and 38% of our 5th grade students scored a 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA. 50% of 3rd grade, 55% of 4th grade, and 55% 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: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2021, AP2 January 2022, and AP3 May 2022 K-5: i-Ready 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 walkthroughs levels of student engagement will be noted by the administration and feedback will be provided to teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy from John Hattie is "Direct Instruction" with an effect size of 0.59.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "Direct Instruction with a 0.59 effect size". Typically, the steps include: teacher specifies outcomes, teacher communicates success criteria, gives direct instruction on the lesson, teacher provides guided practice, and students then have independent practice. This scaffolds the learning process and supports students through guided and independent practice.

Action Steps to Implement

K-5 teachers will collaborate to plan direct instruction ELA lessons and use of Hatties' strategy of Direct Instruction of reading strategies within the ELA block. Teachers will show evidence of guided and independent practice in the 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 Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@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.

School staff will promote a positive learning environment with implementation of the Caring School Community SEL program and the implementation of our PBIS program. The school administrative team along with a committee of staff volunteers promote positive culture by recognizing school staff throughout the year as well as promoting themed days for both staff and students to celebrate learning in a safe environment. The administrative team, teachers, and paraprofessionals will plan and implement parent night events that will build the capacity of parents/guardians/caregivers and students to promote a healthy socio-psychological environment and increase intellectual stimulation in the home.

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

Stanton-Weirsdale Elementary School is a community based school which has partnerships with community groups. The school also has a Business Partner that meets regularly with administration to determine how it may continue to best support the school with resources. The School Advisory Council meets minimum four times a year to address current data, curriculum, and needs of the students, staff, and community and decisions are made through the council. The staff meets minimum once a month in committees to address the various areas of the school campus to determine strengths and needs to be worked on. The school encompasses common language to instill a positive culture on campus as well as a growth mindset in all classrooms. There is a community Care Closet where families can request household support, students can get shoes and clothes, and food when needed to help provide a well-rounded environment for all students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00