

Marion County Public Schools

Dr N H Jones 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	23

Dr N H Jones Elementary School

1900 SW 5TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Hensel

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2021

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)	68%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (83%) 2017-18: A (81%) 2016-17: A (86%)
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	23

Dr N H Jones Elementary School

1900 SW 5TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	60%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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.

In an innovative environment, students will excel in basic academics with enhanced learning in STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Mathematics).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dr. N. H. Jones Elementary, where every child will achieve academic excellence.

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
Abbruzzi, Julie	School Counselor	-Assist with socio-emotional needs of students and staff. -Assist with MTSS. -Assist with IEP/EP/504 compliance
Houle, Jennifer	Principal	-Monitor data -Coach teachers on instructional practices -Lead grade level discussions -Determine school wide needs based on data -Determine professional development needs of the school
Coleman, Lisa	Assistant Principal	-Monitor data -Coach teachers on instructional practices -Lead grade level discussions -Lead MTSS/PMP -School Assessment Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/26/2021, Robert Hensel

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

762

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

5

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

9

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	127	141	138	121	106	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	731
Attendance below 90 percent	26	16	15	19	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	6	2	2	11	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	16	18	19	10	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	16	17	6	17	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	18	15	9	16	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	127	140	139	123	103	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	731
Attendance below 90 percent	0	42	38	33	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	127	140	139	123	103	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	731
Attendance below 90 percent	0	42	38	33	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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				91%	47%	57%	92%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				78%	56%	58%	74%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				77%	52%	53%	71%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				93%	51%	63%	94%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				81%	58%	62%	72%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	49%	51%	78%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				90%	47%	53%	89%	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	91%	44%	47%	58%	33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	94%	49%	45%	58%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
05	2021					
	2019	90%	45%	45%	56%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-94%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	95%	49%	46%	62%	33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	89%	54%	35%	64%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-95%				
05	2021					
	2019	95%	45%	50%	60%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	90%	44%	46%	53%	37%
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 levels 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	65 / 49%	63 / 47%	92 / 68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 / 24%	11 / 22%	21 / 41%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 10%
	English Language Learners	1 / 100%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42 / 31%	55 / 41%	98 / 73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 14%	12 / 24%	22 / 43%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	2 / 20%	3 / 30%
	English Language Learners	1 / 100%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	74 / 54%	70 / 51%	80 / 58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19 / 44%	16 / 36%	20 / 44%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 30%	3 / 30%	4 / 40%
	English Language Learners	1 / 33%	1 / 33%	1 / 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46 / 34%	46 / 33%	78 / 57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 26%	8 / 18%	14 / 31%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 30%	3 / 30%	6 / 60%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	2 / 67%	2 / 67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	77 / 66%	69 / 58%	79 / 67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19 / 44%	17 / 39%	20 / 45%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 33%	1 / 33%	1 / 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	37 / 32%	41 / 35%	71 / 61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 14%	7 / 16%	18 / 42%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 17%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71 / 70%	55 / 52%	68 / 65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 50%	4 / 16%	10 / 40%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 50%	0 / 0%	1 / 17%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	64 / 63%	57 / 54%	83 / 81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 45%	6 / 24%	13 / 54%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 75%	2 / 33%	3 / 50%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63 / 66%	45 / 47%	47 / 49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 35%	7 / 33%	4 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 50%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58 / 61%	55 / 57%	62 / 65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 30%	4 / 19%	6 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79 / 83%	70 / 74%	63 / 68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 / 60%	8 / 40%	7 / 35%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 50%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners			

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				40							
ASN	84	80		95	90		100				
BLK	64	61	50	60	61	69	29				
HSP	74			78							
MUL	83			83							
WHT	89	78	82	87	77		88				
FRL	61	50	45	59	61	64	38				
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	70										
ASN	100	78		100	91		100				
BLK	74	71	62	78	66	55	70				

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	95	93		100	93						
MUL	83			75							
WHT	96	79	83	96	82	73	94				
FRL	80	78	54	79	72	61	74				
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
ASN	100	90		100	85		100				
BLK	73	53	58	76	53	67	53				
HSP	100	80		100	90						
WHT	95	76	73	97	73	80	93				
FRL	80	60	60	84	59	72	72				

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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	76
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	83
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	84
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	54
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?

More students appear to be proficient in math rather than reading in K, 1st, 2nd, 4th, and 5th. 3rd grade students seem to struggle with proficiency in reading and math. Students seem to make significant gains in reading in grades K-2, however gains in reading in 3rd-5th using iReady data become stagnant.

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

ELA scores in iReady showed the greatest need for improvement in kindergarten through 3rd grade. The students in 4th and 5th grade were remaining steady in iReady proficiency and FSA data.

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 have entered Dr. NH Jones at a different academic level than in years past. More differentiation needs to occur to ensure that students are understanding the standard to the depth of the standard. Teachers will need more support in meeting the academic needs of lower performing students. In addition, the teachers had new reading curriculum to support the Florida Standards. While the curriculum was a resource it required teachers to find supplemental materials to teach the standards with limited support.

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

Math scores showed the most improvement using iReady data in K-2 and FSA in 4th.

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

The math standards and curriculum resources have remained consistent for several years. The teachers have a grasp of the expectation of the standard and how to supplement instruction for mastery. Students are also using manipulatives for hands on learning. The students have access to IXL and iReady lessons to help support instruction.

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

In order to accelerate learning, Dr. NH Jones will need to use data to ensure that students are placed appropriately in their intervention groups or enrichment groups for both reading and math. In addition to support, students will also need differentiated instruction, scaffolding, and small group learning opportunities to allow for mastery of a standard. The school will also continue to meet with teachers for collaborative planning that will occur two times a week, allowing teachers to look at standards and plan for standards based instruction.

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.

Based on the factors and strategies, teachers will need additional professional development on scaffolding instruction. With the support of district program specialists, professional development opportunities will be provided around scaffolding instruction. In addition, the ESE specialist assigned to Dr. NH Jones will provide professional development to support students with IEPs who are currently being served with a support facilitator. Professional development will also be provided to teachers for prescribed interventions and differentiation.

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

An intervention teacher has been added to the staff of Dr. NH Jones. This individual will assist with providing additional intervention supports to students based on the data and their individual need. This person will also attend district coaching meetings in reading and math to assist teachers with planning and collaboration.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

The overall percentage of students that were proficient in reading as measured by the FSA declined from 91% to 81% for the 2020-2021 school year. When reviewing the iReady data, students in 1st and 2nd grade have scores that increased the number of non-proficient students on our campus. Gaps are being seen in multiple areas of reading that are increasing as our students progress into state tested grade levels. In addition the number of students that are attaining a learning gain as measured by FSA has decreased from 78% to 74% and the learning gains in our bottom quartile have decreased from 77% to 64%.

Measurable Outcome:

Students will increase in overall ELA proficiency in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade by 3% from 81% to 84%. Students will increase ELA learning gains in reading by 3% in 4th and 5th grade from 74% to 77%, as well as our retained 3rd graders as measured by the 2022 FSA assessment.

Monitoring:

Data will be collected using iReady Diagnostic Data, iReady Progress Monitoring Data, and the district local QSMA assessment. The data collected will be broken down by domains and standards within ELA after each assessment. Trends will be identified across the grade level as well as within individual classes. Teachers will participate in data digs following assessments to disaggregate data. Parents and students will be notified of this data through parent conferences between the teacher and the parent. Teachers will also have individual data meetings with students to discuss progress and set goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will use scaffolding and higher-level questioning to ensure that students are taught to the depth of the standard. Teachers will also use daily check for understandings as formative assessments to monitor learning and mastery of a standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Standards are not being taught to the depth and rigor that they are written. Teachers will refer to the item specs to ensure that they have a clear understanding of what is expected of a student for mastery. Using scaffolding and higher-level questioning will allow students to understand and apply concepts and skills that are being taught.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative Planning sessions with teachers in all grade levels twice each week. Teachers will use a 4 week cycle to plan for instruction. Two weeks will be focused on planning instruction. Week 3 will include work samples and artifacts, and week 4 will be learning walks across campus.

Teachers will collaborate with administration and their peers to create standards based lessons and plan small group differentiated instruction using formative assessments. During the collaboration teachers will look at the standards that are being taught and determine resources to use to differentiate the standard to the varying level of students in the classroom. The work samples will be viewed to see the differentiation and scaffolding that was implemented. Teachers will also discuss formative assessments that will be used which would include higher level questioning.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

Data digs with teachers using current assessment data.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

PMP meetings will be conducted to discuss student progress and interventions (3x year).

Person
Responsible Lisa Coleman (lisa.coleman@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The overall percentage of students that were proficient in reading as measured by the FSA declined from 93% to 81% for the 2020-2021 school year. When reviewing the iReady data, students 2nd grade have scores that increased the number of non-proficient students on our campus. Gaps are being seen in multiple areas of math that are increasing as our students progress into state tested grade levels. In addition the number of students that are attaining a learning gain as measured by FSA has decreased from 81% to 76% and the learning gains in our bottom quartile have decreased from 71% to 67%.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will increase in overall Math proficiency in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade by 3% from 81%-84%. Students will increase Math learning gains by 3% from 76% to 79% in 4th and 5th grade as measured by the 2022 FSA Math assessment
Monitoring:	Data will be collected using iReady Diagnostic Data, iReady Progress Monitoring Data, and the district local QSMA assessment. The data collected will be broken down by domains and standards within Math after each assessment. Trends will be identified across the grade level as well as within individual classes. Teachers will participate in data digs following assessments to disaggregate data. Parents and students will be notified of this data through parent conferences between the teacher and the parent. Teachers will also have individual data meetings with students to discuss progress and set goals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use scaffolding to ensure that students are taught to the depth of the standard. Teachers will also use daily check for understandings as formative assessments to monitor learning and mastery of a standard. Students will be provided for hands on learning opportunities daily in math instruction to move from concrete to abstract.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are not given as much hands on application during math instruction. Students need manipulatives and the opportunity to learn using various teaching modalities. Teachers will refer to the item specs to ensure that they have a clear understanding of what is expected of a student for mastery. Using scaffolding and hands on learning opportunities, students will be prepared to apply concepts and skills that are being taught when asked grade level questions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative Planning sessions with teachers in all grade levels twice each week. Teachers will use a 4 week cycle to plan for instruction. Two weeks will be focused on planning instruction. Week 3 will include work samples and artifacts, and week 4 will be learning walks across campus.

Teachers will collaborate with administration and their peers to create standards based lessons and plan small group differentiated instruction using formative assessments.

Person Responsible Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will be provided additional math support from district math program specialist to assist with planning, differentiation, and strategies.

Person Responsible Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

PMP meetings will be conducted to discuss student progress and interventions (3x year).

Person Responsible Lisa Coleman (lisa.coleman@marion.k12.fl.us)

Data digs with teachers using current assessment data.

Person Responsible Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our school is not listed. This year we have implemented a school wide PBIS program. Our focus is on safety, kindness, and being responsible. We are asking our teachers to use this school wide system as a common language when supporting students in making positive choices throughout the day.

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.

Building relationships is at the core of our school. We emphasize building relationships between students, teachers, parents, and our community stakeholders. Dr. NH Jones implemented a school wide PBIS initiative this school year to ensure that all stakeholders speak the same language. As a STEAM magnet school, Dr. NH Jones imbeds science, technology, engineering, arts, and math across multiple disciplines to provide real world hands on learning opportunities for our students. Our parents are members of our SAC committee as well as our Parent Organization. They play a key role in our school performance.

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

Parent Organization (PO) includes many parents from our school community. This organization helps to raise funds throughout the year to provide additional resources to the campus. This group also provides fun activities throughout the year for our staff and students.

SAC includes parents, teachers, and members of the community. The SAC community bridges the gap

between the school and our families.

Parents attend school events and conferences with teachers on a regular basis.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00