

Marion County Public Schools

Shady Hill 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Shady Hill Elementary School

5959 S MAGNOLIA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Anna Streater Mcallister

Start Date for this Principal: 8/6/2021

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)	98%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%)
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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Shady Hill Elementary School

5959 S MAGNOLIA AVE, 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	Yes	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at Shady Hill is to create an environment where ALL children, regardless of differences, will be able to succeed academically, physically, and emotionally to their maximum ability.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a positive, family-oriented and engaging environment where children will recognize and achieve their fullest potential.

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
Riedl, Debra	Principal	Oversees the day-to-day operations of the school including safety, operations, curriculum, and recruiting and retaining staff.
Steinke, Amber	Assistant Principal	Oversees the curriculum aspect of the school including standards-based instruction, assessment, intervention programs, and progress monitoring.
Sprung, Lisa	School Counselor	Oversees the well-being of students, Social Emotional Learning Program, Social Work services at the school level, and the IEP process for students with disabilities. The school counselor also assists with Problem solving and the MTSS process.
Catalanotto, Susan	Dean	Coordinates the school's Positive Behavior Intervention Program and handles school-wide discipline issues.
Albright, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Coordinates and oversees implementation of Reading instruction and Reading interventions. Provides training and coaching to staff in the area of Reading.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/6/2021, Anna Streater Mcallister

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.*

5

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.*

29

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

566

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

1

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

1

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	79	86	111	92	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	565
Attendance below 90 percent	29	23	21	25	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	13	5	2	16	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	14	17	24	17	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in Math	12	12	16	8	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	37	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	23	18	23	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	2	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/9/2021

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	84	95	104	104	109	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	14	20	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	4	5	5	6	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	9	18	14	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	3	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	84	95	104	104	109	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	14	20	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	4	5	5	6	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	9	18	14	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	3	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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				57%	47%	57%	59%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	56%	58%	52%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	52%	53%	41%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	51%	63%	63%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				71%	58%	62%	51%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	49%	51%	34%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	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	51%	44%	7%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	49%	9%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	45%	7%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	49%	10%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	54%	21%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	45%	14%	60%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

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	11 / 16%	14 / 18%	30 / 38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 9%	6 / 13%	12 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 17%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8 / 11%	14 / 18%	37 / 47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 7%	6 / 13%	19 / 39%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 33%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19 / 23%	36 / 42%	44 / 51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 14%	13 / 29%	16 / 36%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 10%	3 / 30%	3 / 30%
	English Language Learners	1 / 50%	1 / 50%	1 / 50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4 / 5%	8 / 9%	36 / 42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 2%	1 / 2%	11 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 20%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47 / 47%	32 / 30%	48 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22 / 37%	12 / 18%	21 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 20%	4 / 20%	5 / 24%
	English Language Learners	1 / 25%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17 / 17%	19 / 18%	38 / 35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 8%	7 / 11%	13 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 15%	2 / 10%	5 / 24%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18 / 21%	18 / 20%	24 / 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 10%	6 / 12%	5 / 10%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 11%	1 / 5%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11 / 13%	10 / 11%	30 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 6%	2 / 4%	7 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 5%	0 / 0%	3 / 15%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38 / 38%	26 / 26%	33 / 32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 22%	7 / 15%	8 / 16%
	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	36 / 36%	32 / 32%	54 / 52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 21%	9 / 19%	19 / 38%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 18%	1 / 6%	4 / 24%
	English Language Learners	1 / 17%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63 / 68%	46 / 46%	47 / 47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23 / 52%	14 / 29%	14 / 29%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 18%	0 / 0%	2 / 12%
	English Language Learners	1 / 17%	1 / 17%	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	23	50	62	38	53	50	7				
ELL	31			46							
BLK	25	47		34	50		8				
HSP	39	65		66	76		36				
MUL	62			67							
WHT	67	70		82	76	70	68				
FRL	40	65	74	54	64	65	30				
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	30	41	29	40	61	52	36				
ELL	29	30		59	85						
BLK	22	40	29	38	51	38	20				

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	54	57	45	70	77	75	52				
MUL	68	75		68	80		60				
WHT	68	61	48	76	73	52	69				
FRL	40	53	49	53	64	53	40				
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	21	33	26	20	30	22	17				
ELL	38			38							
BLK	27	33	36	41	39	39	23				
HSP	59	61	58	61	56		60				
MUL	68	57		72	50						
WHT	67	55	40	69	53	27	69				
FRL	48	46	39	52	45	37	51				

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	65
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	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
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	50
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	33
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	59
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	65
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	72
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	57
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 ELA learning gains, specifically with our African American student population. The African American Subgroup was the only subground on the Federal Index below 41% (34%). There is a large number of students with two or more Early Warning indicators across all grade levels, with grades 2, 3, and 4 being the highest. (18, 14, 13 respectively) Additionally 3rd grade ELA scores decreased from 47% to 43% proficiency from the first iReady Diagnostic to the third. All other grade levels increased from the first iReady Diagnostic to the third. Approximately 50% of Economically disadvantaged students demonstrated proficiency on all three iReady diagnostic assessments across all grade levels. The percentage of proficient students from the first to the third assessment increased in all grade levels for our Students with Disabilities.

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

Students with disabilities and English Language Learners are not making adequate Learning Gains in ELA or Math. In addition, the African American subgroup was the only subgroup who did not meet the 41% on the Federal Index. Also, additional focus needs to be on 1st grade ELA as well as Science proficiency for our 5th grade students.

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

Contributing factors may include a lack of small group targeted instruction in the classroom during the 90-minute ELA block as well as a lack of effective formative assessment. Our school's Area of Focus for this year will be increasing effective Formative Assessment in the classroom, which will allow teachers the opportunity to assess student performance throughout lessons and units of study. Teachers will participate in ongoing Professional Development in this area. The consistent use of Formative Assessment will allow teachers to identify gaps in the learning of individual students. Differentiated groups will be formed for reteaching and enrichments. Instruction will be targeted to meet the needs of all learners.

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

ELA proficiency in grade two had the highest increase of all grade levels from 23% to 51%. Math proficiency in all grade levels increased with the largest gains showing in first and second grades. First Grade Math proficiency increased 36 percentage points and second Grade increased 37 percentage points. In addition, Grade one students with disabilities increased from 0% to 33% proficiency from the first to the last assessment.

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

Teachers participated in targeted collaborative planning sessions weekly to look at standards, class performance, work samples, and upcoming lesson plans. Additionally, morning and afternoon tutoring was offered to specific student groups. Our intervention teacher conducted a 30-minute close reading group every morning before school. In addition, our school's professional development focus for the past three years has been on increasing rigor through high level questioning and academic discussion. There was a marked increase of the implementation of strategies learned related to this area of focus as measured by the Teacher Observation Tool. The percentage of teachers scoring highly effective in the area of student questioning and discussion increased over the past three years from 42% in 2019, 50% in 2020, and 55% in 2021.

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

Professional development in the area of formative assessment will be ongoing for our teachers this year. This will allow teachers to assess where their students are on a regular basis so that they can adjust and accelerate the learning for individual students in the class. Teachers will learn a variety of formative assessment strategies to use with their students and will be provided timely feedback on the implementation of the strategies. Proper scaffolding will be offered to students throughout classroom lessons. In addition to Spotlight Standards, Supporting standards will also be a focus. Teachers will teach Supporting Standards alongside the Spotlight Standard increasing exposure to the key concepts for success. Flexible small groups will be formed using the data from formative assessments to teach the standards to mastery and continuing to new standards in a timely manner. Some students lack foundational skills necessary to master the standards and require intervention to help with the acceleration process. Students with significant deficits in phonics will participate in a Phonics for Reading small group with a Reading Endorsed teacher. Great Leaps will be used one on one with students to increase phonics and fluency. Both of these programs provide increased practice on foundational skills in a variety of ways.

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.

A team of teachers and administrators met to look at data and select professional development opportunities to be implemented throughout the year. During the three-day collaborative planning session, professional development was aligned, developed, and shared out to the team. There will be a series of eight professional development opportunities for our teachers which all include teaching, learning, implementing, and evaluating a variety of formative assessment strategies. The daily formative assessments will be used during weekly collaborative planning to develop a variety of different activities based on learning needs in the classroom. Lessons will be differentiated for students allowing teachers to meet with those struggling more frequently and for longer periods of time using a variety of learning modalities. During the collaborative planning process, we will also focus on providing students with small group and independent opportunities to practice the skills. Activities will be focused on Spotlight and Supporting Standards leading to a spiral review throughout the year.

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

A team of teachers and administrators examine the data (local and state data, as well as teacher observation data) and design professional development aligned to the needs of the school. During the evaluation of the previous year's plan, the team decides what changes need to be made to the learning cycle for the following year, in order to yield better results. The effectiveness of the prior year's professional development opportunities is assessed based on the data. Previously, we

successfully focused on increasing student engagement through high level questioning and academic discussions. Learning gains in the lowest quartile increased from 44% to 70% from 2019 to 2021. This year we will focus on formative assessment in the classroom to provide better differentiation of small groups. The formative assessment piece will be included in weekly collaboration. Small group activities planned will be based on the formative assessments. However, we also expect the strong academic discussions in our classrooms to continue. Throughout the school year, ongoing and timely feedback is provided to teachers at weekly collaborative planning meetings as well as in individual conferences with teachers. Strong practices by the teachers will be shared out during Teach Tuesday trainings.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is a need for increased small group instruction and formative assessment in the classroom during the 90-minute ELA block. Our school's Area of Focus for this year will be increasing effective Formative Assessment in the classroom, which will allow teachers the opportunity to assess student performance throughout lessons and units of study and provide more targeted instruction to individual and groups of students, therefore increasing student engagement and ownership. Teachers will participate in ongoing Professional Development in this area. On the 2021 FSA Assessment, 46% of students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3. (50% in grade 3, 61% in grade 4, and 32% in grade 5 did not score a level 3 or higher.)
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Goal #1 - ELA proficiency will increase from 54% to 59% as measured by the 2021-2022 FSA assessment.</p> <p>On the 2021 iReady Diagnostic Reading final overall placement, 92% of our kindergarteners, 58% of our 1st graders, and 69% of our 2nd graders were proficient. On the 2022 iReady Diagnostic Reading final overall placement, 95% of our kindergarteners, 63% of our 1st graders, and 74% of our 2nd graders will be proficient.</p> <p>On the 2022 FSA Assessment, 55% of grade 3 students, 44% of grade 4 students, and 72% of grade 5 students will score a level 3 or higher.</p>
Monitoring:	Ongoing professional development will take place in the area of formative assessment throughout the school year. Teachers will learn strategies that can be implemented in the classroom immediately. Administrators and coaches will provide individual and timely feedback to teachers on their practice. In addition, data from two components that address formative assessment on the teacher evaluation rubric will be considered. (Growth in percentage of teachers scoring effective or highly effective from the first to a subsequent observation.) Student data will be monitored and collected throughout the year using iReady Diagnostic and Progress monitoring. District assessments including Quarterly Assessments and Standards Checks will provide data on standards mastery as well as areas needing remediation for students. 3rd grade portfolio data will also be used for monitoring student progress. All assessment data will be utilized in weekly collaborative planning sessions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy is the use of effective formative assessment. Teachers will learn to collect evidence about how student learning is progressing during the course of instruction. Formative Assessment is a process that involves students and teachers as active participants in the learning process. Teachers will conduct in-process evaluations of student comprehension, learning needs, and academic progress during a lesson or unit. Both students and teachers evaluate the learning. Some types of Formative Assessments that will be implemented at our school site are Focused Observations, use of checklists, Peer Review, Self-Reflection, and Anonymous Voting. The data collected from the use of Formative Assessment will be used to create differentiated groups in order to meet individual student needs through enrichment and remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-	Formative assessment strategies will allow teachers to evaluate student learning within a standard or standards, it can increase student engagement, and can help students take ownership of their learning. 43% of our students in grades 3 through 5 are non-proficient in

**based
Strategy:**

Reading, and 56% of our students in grades K-2 are non-proficient in Reading. It is critical to recognize and bridge gaps in learning throughout the instructional process, and provide proper scaffolding before the end of a lesson or unit. If our goal is for students to achieve standards mastery, then it is necessary to recognize early on where the gaps in learning are occurring and provide appropriate intervention. It is equally as important that teachers are providing the most appropriate feedback to students so that teaching and learning both improve.

Action Steps to Implement

Teams of teachers and administrators evaluated previous professional development related to the school's Area of Focus from 2018-2021 related to Student discussion and high level questioning. Achievement data as well as observation data revealed improvements in percentages of learning gains and teacher observation components. ELA bottom quartile learning gains increased from 44% in 2019 to 70% in 2021. The percentage of teachers who were rated highly effective in Student discussion and questioning increased from 42% in 2019 to 55% in 2021. Planning teams created a professional development plan for the upcoming school year that aligns with this year's Area of Focus: improving Formative Assessment using research-based strategies. Each member of the team planned a professional development session and a plan to evaluate that session. Sessions will be conducted after school and on Early Release days.

Person Responsible Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

At each professional development session, teachers will walk away with a new strategy to implement in the classroom. Before leaving the session, teachers will indicate how they will utilize the strategy and what the expected outcome will be. The strategies will be implemented before the end of the week. Throughout the week during classroom walk-throughs, administrators will provide feedback on strategies that were implemented in the classroom. Feedback will be provided to teachers via their preferred method; face-to-face, email, or handwritten note. Teachers will reflect on the strategy on the same document they used to indicate how they would implement the strategy. They will include a statement regarding whether or not the expected outcome was achieved. Teachers will turn in that document by the end of the week and administrators will leave a comment.

Person Responsible Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

During weekly collaborative planning sessions, teachers will discuss the effectiveness of their Formative Assessment strategy by inspecting student work samples and assessment data. During the planning session, teachers will include Formative Assessment strategies that match the standards for the upcoming week. The expectation is that they plan not only the end of lesson check for understandings, but formative assessments to conduct throughout the lesson. Teachers and administrators will examine classroom assessments, diagnostic assessments, quarterly assessments, and progress monitoring assessments. This will allow teachers to adjust their instruction and differentiate instruction for all learners while planning whole groups, small group, and center activities. Formative assessments will allow teachers to check students understanding of the content throughout the lesson and make adjustments accordingly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is a need for increased small group instruction and formative assessment in the classroom during the 90-minute ELA block. Our school's Area of Focus for this year will be increasing effective Formative Assessment in the classroom, which will allow teachers the opportunity to assess student performance throughout lessons and units of study and provide more targeted instruction to individual and groups of students, therefore increasing student engagement and ownership. Teachers will participate in ongoing Professional Development in this area.
Measurable Outcome:	Goal #2 - Student proficiency identified with a federal index below 41% in the area of ELA will increase by 5% as measured by the 2021-2022 FSA assessment scores.
Monitoring:	Students proficiency in ELA for the subgroup with a federal index below 41% will be monitored throughout the year. The data from iReady (Benchmark and Progress Monitoring) assessments and District Assessments (Quarterly and Standards Checks) will be analyzed and utilized during weekly collaboration as well as Progress Monitoring Meetings to provide appropriate interventions for the subgroup. Necessary changes in instruction setting and style will be made based on the evaluations used to monitor achievement. Specific Formative Assessments will be documented through the use of teacher checklists and classroom observations. Feedback will be provided to teachers after observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A proactive approach in the classroom through the use of formative assessment will result in greater success for our ESSA Subgroup below 41% in reading. Creating a flexible grouping based on formative assessment will increase standards mastery in the classroom. Many of the students in this subgroup are also receiving small group intensive interventions by our intervention teacher. Formative Assessments in the form of focused observations and check-ups guide the pacing of the intervention programs. In addition, the Title 1 paraprofessional will work one-on-one with these students to increase learning gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Formative assessment will dictate the pace used during small group and intervention leading to mastery of necessary skills. The foundational skills addressed during intervention require mastery to advance. Students will also use self-evaluation creating ownership in learning and promoting greater student engagement

Action Steps to Implement

Using formative assessment to create small groups required the addition of an Intervention Teacher and a Title 1 Paraprofessional. Specific training is provided to all teachers including these individuals on the research based programs used to increase student growth. Assessment data will be used to appropriately place students in intervention groups based on individual learning deficits. MTSS will be implemented with fidelity using the accepted programs for intervention. The fidelity will be documented using CUR 40 Fidelity forms and observations by administration. The learning cycle will continue as we look at iReady and District assessments to evaluate student growth.

Person Responsible Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students in our ESSA subgroups below 41% will receive a special invitation for tutoring. Tutoring will be offered after school and also in the morning before school starts. The intervention teacher will organize the morning group and work on close reading strategies. Using data from iReady, quarterly assessment, and

standards checks, specific skills will be embedded into the lessons in order to help close the gaps in learning. Approximately 50% of students who are economically disadvantaged students in grades four and five did not meet the proficiency target on the third diagnostic assessment in iReady Reading at the end of the 2021 schoolyear. A large percentage of these students are also in the lowest quartile and will be invited to tutoring and closely monitored throughout the schoolyear.

Person Responsible Debra Riedl (debra.riedl@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students in an ESSA subgroup below 41% will be assigned a mentor with whom they can check in and check out regularly. Our school's multi-disciplinary team will meet to discuss individual student needs and each member of the team will be assigned a student as a mentor. Mentors will meet with students weekly during lunch and will work with the student to set goals, read together, and assist the student with building confidence.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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.

Two areas of concern are the high number of out of school suspensions and incidences of a violent nature. A team of eight staff members attending a 12-hour Positive Behavior Intervention Support training. After looking at discipline and school culture data, the team generated ideas and developed a plan for the upcoming school year. The Student Services Manager will oversee the implementation of the plan, which will include explicit expectations for behavior across all settings, school-wide and individual recognition for positive behavior, incentives and rewards at regular intervals, and individualized and relevant consequences for negative behavior. This will be monitored by the leadership team and data will be shared with staff and with the School Advisory Council. Data will also be shared through multi-disciplinary team meetings, progress monitoring meetings, and problem-solving meetings.

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.

Shady Hill Elementary prides itself on involving stakeholders in the decision-making process, and in participating in activities around our campus. We welcome and encourage families to stay involved and volunteer. With a new Positive Behavior Support plan in place and a multitude of opportunities for the upcoming school year, there will be a variety of activities that parents will be involved in. Additionally, quarterly School Advisory Council meetings will be held where parents, community members, and business partners are invited.

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

Business partners stay involved by attending and participating in School Advisory Council meetings, attending festivals and performances, providing resources for our staff and students, and by supporting our school's mission and vision. Community members are encouraged to tour our campus and learn about our school. They can often be found reading to students or presenting at Career Day. Family members attend School Advisory Council meetings, Parent Conference Night, other Family Nights, and volunteer at a variety of events. School board members attend SAC meetings, and district personnel visit classrooms. Our local grocery store invites students in for a Publix Math Night, where students and their families use the products to solve math problems.

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: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00