

Marion County Public Schools

Ocala Springs 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	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Ocala Springs Elementary School

5757 NE 40TH AVENUE RD, Ocala, FL 34479

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Cino

Start Date for this Principal: 1/22/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 (48%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (46%)
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	24

Ocala Springs Elementary School

5757 NE 40TH AVENUE RD, Ocala, FL 34479

[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 KG-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	49%

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 is to empower our students to use higher order thinking skills, responsible decision making strategies, and problem solving skills necessary to grow academically and socially. Teachers and staff will utilize various forms of data to make instructional decisions that are best for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Ocala Springs, our vision is to enhance our instructional delivery in all areas with the purpose of developing successful citizens - every student, every day.

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
Cino, Michelle	Principal	The principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She 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.
Manning, Donald	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.
Prestipino, Angela	School Counselor	The guidance counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; 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.
Tarantino, Matthew	Dean	The student services manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families
Hall, Stephanie	Instructional 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 alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring including data collection and data analysis. She participates in the design and delivery of professional development.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/22/2019, Michelle Cino

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.*

1

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

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

620

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

2

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

2

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	91	86	99	106	99	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	584
Attendance below 90 percent	36	39	31	39	41	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
One or more suspensions	2	6	4	5	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	8	33	32	31	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Course failure in Math	11	21	30	17	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	7	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	10	34	31	31	20	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155

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	1	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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

Friday 8/13/2021

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	92	89	111	100	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	570
Attendance below 90 percent	4	16	18	21	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	6	4	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	5	10	20	15	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	7	8	10	7	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	46	29	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	11	16	21	7	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	92	89	111	100	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	570
Attendance below 90 percent	4	16	18	21	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	6	4	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	5	10	20	15	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	7	8	10	7	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	46	29	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	11	16	21	7	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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				53%	47%	57%	51%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	56%	58%	46%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	52%	53%	33%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	51%	63%	53%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	58%	62%	55%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	49%	51%	29%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	47%	53%	59%	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	48%	44%	4%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	45%	1%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	45%	0%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	42%	44%	-2%	53%	-11%
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	11 / 14%	11 / 13%	24 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 7%	5 / 9%	14 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	2 / 17%	2 / 17%
	English Language Learners	1 / 17%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9 / 11%	6 / 7%	25 / 30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 11%	2 / 3%	14 / 25%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 8%	1 / 8%
	English Language Learners	1 / 17%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11 / 12%	18 / 20%	32 / 35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 8%	10 / 17%	17 / 27%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	2 / 13%	3 / 20%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6 / 7%	8 / 9%	28 / 30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 7%	5 / 8%	14 / 23%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	4 / 27%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26 / 27%	22 / 22%	29 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 / 18%	9 / 13%	12 / 18%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 14%	4 / 17%	4 / 17%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7 / 7%	15 / 15%	31 / 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 / 3%	5 / 7%	15 / 22%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 10%	2 / 9%	3 / 13%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26 / 30%	22 / 24%	26 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16 / 24%	14 / 21%	16 / 25%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 13%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18 / 21%	12 / 13%	23 / 25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 17%	6 / 9%	12 / 18%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 13%	1 / 13%
	English Language Learners	1 / 13%	2 / 25%	2 / 25%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27 / 29%	11 / 11%	18 / 18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 25%	7 / 11%	14 / 23%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19 / 20%	14 / 14%	29 / 30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 18%	10 / 16%	19 / 31%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57 / 63%	46 / 48%	30 / 42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36 / 60%	29 / 47%	24 / 41%
	Students With Disabilities	8 / 62%	6 / 46%	4 / 31%
	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	30	24		44	41	60	27				
ELL	27			53							
BLK	36	27		48	55		32				
HSP	41	33		49	67		33				
MUL	39			50							
WHT	54	56	43	64	67	67	45				
FRL	43	42	29	52	59	63	43				
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	16	41	35	20	36	35	19				
ELL	46	40		38	50						
BLK	34	50	43	36	44	21	28				

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	50	47		43	53		29				
MUL	60	58		67	50						
WHT	59	59	43	56	55	26	50				
FRL	48	54	46	47	50	31	38				
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	34	35	16	19	16	39				
ELL	14			14							
BLK	28	43	39	42	41	13	36				
HSP	42	37	27	49	57		50				
MUL	47	36		71	82						
WHT	62	52	28	57	60	35	72				
FRL	44	43	32	47	51	29	48				

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	56
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	93
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
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	58
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	40
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	45
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	57
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?

There is a need for improvement in ELA proficiency and growth. Specifically with our SWD in the following data trends: 18% in third, fourth and fifth grades were proficient on the FSA ELA in 2018 and 19% were proficient on the FSA ELA in 2019. 33% of students in the ELA bottom quartile made learning gains on the 2018 FSA, and in 2019 that number rose to 48%. In 2021 38% of the ELA bottom quartile made learning gains.

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

SWD were 19% proficient in 2019 ELA FSA and the African American subgroup did not meet the 41% Federal Index.

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 with direct instruction on their IEP were in a self-contained unit excluded from instruction with their peers in a general education classroom. In 2021-2022 school year, students are in inclusion classrooms receiving direct instruction from a support facilitator and the classroom teacher. MTSS Interventions will be specific to individual student needs based on iReady and QSMA data.

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

Math FSA proficiency showed a 28% increase in going from 31% in 2019 to 59% in 2021. In addition, Math growth went from 53% to 59% and bottom quartile growth rose from 31% in 2019 to 62% in 2021.

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

Teachers participated in collaborative planning specific to math once a week. Students used a new online program, Reflex Math, for math computation. Administration did 10 minute walk-throughs in math classrooms providing immediate feedback for instructional improvement. iReady instruction reports were pulled weekly by classroom and bottom quartile groups and provided to teachers to monitor small groups and individuals. iReady professional development focused on differentiating instruction specifically looking at increasing growth.

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

Students will continue to use Reflex Math to further increase students' computation proficiency. An intervention teacher has been added to the faculty at Ocala Springs to monitor learning and provide acceleration strategies.

ELA teachers will create formative and formal assessment calendars each quarter and bring data to each collaborative planning session to plan for small group instruction and reteaching. iReady professional development will focus on increasing ELA proficiency and growth.

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.

Third through fifth grade math teachers will participate in collaborative training twice a week instead of once. The iReady trainer will provide professional development to help teachers monitor progress for the ELA bottom quartile and accelerate learning for our borderline proficient students. Teachers will participate in professional development cooperative learning strategies during faculty meetings.

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

The home school liaison will monitor attendance for all students in the bottom quartile and ESSA subgroups while providing learning resources to the families. Teachers will communicate student progress with parents during parent conference nights, progress reports, report cards, and assessment data reports. Teachers will continue to receive coaching and support planning for small group instruction and remediation.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Ocala Springs has an area of focus in instructional practice in ELA, because there is a need for increased proficiency and growth, specifically with the SWD students based on the FSA data that the following data trends show: Our 2021 AP3 iReady diagnostic showed that 40% of students are not on track to be proficient: 16% of Kindergarten, 60% of 1st grade, and 44% of 2nd grade. Our 2021 ELA FSA data shows the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3: 62% of 3rd grade, 53% of 4th grade, and 54% of 5th grade.

Measurable Outcome:

On the 2021-2022 iReady AP1 Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement, 15% of the kindergarten students were proficient, 8% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 13% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. On the 2022 iReady AP3 Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement 80% of Kindergarten, 65% of 1st grade, and 55% of 2nd grade will be proficient.

On the 2021 ELA FSA, 38% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 47% of our 4th grade students scored a 3 or higher, and 46% of our 5th grade students scored a 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA, 50% of 3rd grade, 45% of 4th grade, and 58% 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. The reading coach and intervention teacher will monitor iReady Growth Monitoring monthly, as well as iReady instructional practice pass rates each week. The leadership team will monitor growth using the August, January and April diagnostic assessment in iReady and the QSMA assessments at the end of each quarter. During classroom walk-throughs levels of student engagement will be noted by the administration and feedback will be provided to teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donald Manning (donald.manning@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies represents direct instruction has a effect size of 0.59. when the teacher specifies learning outcomes/intentions, the teacher knows and communicates success criteria, the teacher builds commitment and engagement in learning task (the hook), the lesson design: input, model, check for understanding, including guided practice, closure, and independent practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

38% of students in the bottom quartile achieved growth on the 2021 ELA FSA. Direct instruction will provide opportunity for frequent checks for understanding and guided practice during the MTSS block. Direct instruction has a .59 effect size according to Hatties Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development on formative assessments and formative feedback for teachers.
2. Teachers will participate in data disaggregation during collaborative planning and build formative assessments to be used with upcoming lessons. K-5 teachers will collaborate to plan phonics and vocabulary instruction and direct instruction for remediation with reading strategies within the ELA block. Teachers will show evidence of direct instruction 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.
3. Leadership will monitor and provide formative feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible Michelle Cino (michelle.cino@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Ocala Springs has an area of focus in the African American subgroup, because there is a need for increased growth in the math bottom quartile, as well as science proficiency, based on the FSA data that the following data trends show that in 2018, the bottom quartile in math made 13% growth and in 2019 it was 21% based on the FSA. Science achievement was 36% in 2018 and 28% in 2019.

Measurable Outcome: Ocala Springs teachers will collaboratively plan formative assessments based on standards, previous assessment data, and teacher observations for African American students to ensure they will grow from 36% to 41% in math, based on the 2022 FSA. Science teachers will utilize the tier 1 science resources and district curriculum map resources to collaboratively plan formative assessments for science instruction through which African American students will increase from 28% to 41% proficiency in science.

Monitoring: Math growth will be monitored using QSMA data, iReady growth monitoring reports, and classroom assessments during collaborative planning.

Teachers will monitor science proficiency using QSMA and classroom assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Donald Manning (donald.manning@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The assistant principal and principal will lead math collaborative planning sessions twice a week with a focus on formative feedback for teachers and students. Administration will continue conducting 10-minute walk-throughs to provide immediate feedback. Third through fifth grade African American students will be invited to fall tutoring. The iReady consultant will provide professional development to specifically support our bottom quartile math students. Students will also use the research based program, Reflex Math to support computation. Teachers will utilize the science lab for hands-on science instruction and remediation, as well as using Science Weekly and BrainPop for supplemental instruction and engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The formative assessments will be implemented throughout lessons. Students will receive math remediation and interventions based on 2021 FSA Math scores and AP1 iReady data. Teachers will determine what area of math African American students are struggling in, and provide small group instruction and intervention.

Teachers and leadership team will review QSMA and classroom assessment data in science and create centers and small group lessons for students struggling in certain benchmarks.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and administrators will work together during ongoing professional development on formative feedback given during their weekly collaboration.
2. Data will be reviewed to specifically target the skills most lacking by our black/African-American subgroup in math and science.

Person Responsible: Michelle Cino (michelle.cino@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.

Ocala Springs Elementary is a PBIS school. The student expectations are consistent across campus. The school pledge is: I am responsible, I am respectful and kind, I am ready to learn, and I do what is right!

School communication is consistent with a phone call and email from the principal each Friday evening, and parents are encouraged to reach out with concerns and suggestions. The school website is kept up to date with calendar of events and links to important information and curriculum support. We encourage our families to join our School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO).

We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum.
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet.
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact.
- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

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

Ocala Springs students are involved with the school-wide PBIS initiative and have a responsibility to monitor their own data, which leads the way to developing a positive school culture. The faculty meets regularly to focus on how to advance a positive culture and environment with PBIS, Parent Engagement, and Student Recognition Committees. The school advisory team is made up of both school employees and community members who provide insight and advice on how to further improve both the activities and the culture of our school. Ocala Springs' business partner, Ocala Electric, are strategic partners on our SAC. Faculty, staff and parents work quarterly on programs to benefit our students, which result in a more positive environment. Members of local organizations work on PTO to support our students by helping raise funds and plan events for them. The district supports our efforts by providing ongoing communication and clear expectations for the MCPS vision. Ocala Springs maintains an open-door policy and welcomes feedback and involvement from parents and families, while being responsive to their needs.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00