Escambia County School District

Molino Park Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Molino Park Elementary

899 HIGHWAY 97, Molino, FL 32577

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Johnecheck D

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Escambia 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

Molino Park Elementary

899 HIGHWAY 97, Molino, FL 32577

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	77%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	19%

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 Escambia 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.

Molino Park Elementary endeavors to prepare each student to be a lifelong learner and a productive citizen. We utilize current research-based educational principles and practices to facilitate maximum student performance.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Molino Park's vision is, “To promote joy in learning in a positive, safe and child-centered environment.”

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
Barnes, Lisa	Principal	
Crites, Jessica	Teacher, PreK	
Blackmon, Kaleigh	Teacher, K-12	
Johnecheck, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	
Sapp, Kate	Teacher, K-12	
Solchenberger, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Bethea, Tara	Teacher, ESE	
Hatch, Rebecca	Instructional Media	
Abrams, Gwen	Other	
Leonard, Maren	Teacher, K-12	
Soileau, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Burke, Gina	School Counselor	
Kite, Sherri	Other	
Varner, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/26/2021, Cheryl Johnecheck D

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

471

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

4

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

5

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	74	96	74	68	91	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	471
Attendance below 90 percent	12	35	16	19	29	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	2	5	1	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	7	5	8	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	17	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	5	3	5	15	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	6	1	7	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	9	7	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/26/2021

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	91	82	61	90	64	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
Attendance below 90 percent	15	18	11	9	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	1	6	1	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	13	7	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	91	82	61	90	64	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
Attendance below 90 percent	15	18	11	9	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	1	6	1	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	13	7	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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				64%	53%	57%	69%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	55%	58%	60%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	52%	53%	50%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				85%	57%	63%	81%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				77%	60%	62%	83%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	52%	51%	84%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				75%	54%	53%	88%	55%	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	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	51%	23%	56%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	88%	55%	33%	62%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	84%	58%	26%	64%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	55%	26%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	76%	55%	21%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

STAR was utilized for Fall, Winter and Spring ELA and Math progress monitoring. The Science district assessment was used for science progress monitoring. The numbers reflect the membership, students tied to the school during both Survey 2 and 3.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/40.8	52/72.2	49/68.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/44.8	20/66.7	18/60.0
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	5/55.6	5/55.6
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27/38.0	46/63.9	46/65.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/27.6	17/56.7	17/58.6
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	2/22.2	4/44.4
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35/57.4	46/74.2	45/71.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/55.2	18/60.0	20/64.5
	Students With Disabilities	4/66.7	4/66.7	1/20.0
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/37.7	41/67.2	41/65.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/31.0	17/58.6	18/58.1
	Students With Disabilities	2/33.3	4/80.0	3/60.0
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24/28.6	40/46.5	46/56.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/15.2	8/25.0	10/33.3
	Students With Disabilities	4/22.2	2/12.5	4/25.0
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39/46.4	53/62.4	59/72.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/27.3	15/48.4	16/53.3
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.6	6/37.5	6/37.5
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32/50.8	41/63.1	35/57.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/45.8	13/50.0	10/43.5
	Students With Disabilities	2/20.0	3/27.3	2/22.2
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35/56.5	51/78.5	51/85.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/47.8	18/69.2	17/73.9
	Students With Disabilities	2/20.0	5/45.5	6/66.7
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23/31.9	33/48.5	35/50.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/32.4	14/48.3	13/41.9
	Students With Disabilities	3/17.6	4/26.7	4/26.7
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18/25.0	33/48.5	41/59.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/29.4	14/48.3	16/51.6
	Students With Disabilities	3/17.6	5/33.3	5/33.3
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	30/47.6	29/47.5	37/58.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/42.9	12/41.4	14/51.9
	Students With Disabilities	3/20.0	3/27.3	4/25.0
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	34	61		55	56		41				
BLK	27			46							
MUL	55			55							
WHT	69	75	77	76	66	58	76				
FRL	57	66	60	65	59	40	64				

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	46	44	35	73	64	60	55				
BLK	33	58		68	75						
WHT	66	60	50	87	77	63	79				
FRL	63	64	56	81	78	64	69				

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	50	45	48	57	75	84					
BLK	47			67							
WHT	73	65	60	84	83	80	88				
FRL	59	45	52	71	79	83	79				

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	68
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	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	

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	37
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
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	71
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	59
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?

Our overall ELA Achievement has been our lowest performance areas. On AP3 data for 2020-2021, our Students With Disabilities ESSA subgroup had a proficiency achievement level of 25% and our African American/Black ESSA subgroup had a proficiency achievement level of 20%. According to the 2020-2021 AP3 data, both of these subgroups were below the 41% mark. However, our overall ELA achievement for the FSA results had a proficiency level of 67%.

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

In 2018-2019, our math lower quartile was 63% compared to 59% in 2020-2021. In 2020-2021, the amount of time teachers had to teach math to lower quartile students was a contributing factor as well as missing instruction due to the pandemic. We have noticed that the students have missed some mathematics foundational skills.

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

In 2020-2021, the amount of time teachers had to teach math to lower quartile students was a contributing factor as well as missing instruction due to the pandemic. We have noticed that the students have missed some mathematics foundational skills. Our focus will be working on math fluency and small group instruction.

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

Our ELA Lowest Quartile went from 54% to 70%.

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

Our fourth and fifth grade teachers, Administration, and Data Teacher Leader monitored their students' data and learning gains. They knew how many gains each student needed to make. Teachers and Administration have data chats with students. Our school focused on supporting small group instruction by using extra personnel. We hired a LTS to support our lower quartile groups in small group instruction. Our media specialist supported small group instruction as well. Our school promoted reading and students reaching their AR goals each quarter. Our school provided tutoring to students that showed weaknesses in our progress monitoring.

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

We will track our AR goals for our students. We will monitor our iReady and STAR reports. We will monitor our math fluency for our students. Our math focus lessons will be developed from progress monitoring data. We will display a wall unit that will help students practice the math factors of multiplication. If funding is available, we will offer tutoring based on students needs. This year, we have an RtI Facilitator that will work with our TIER III students on kindergarten through third grade. The Sonday Systems will be implemented this year.

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.

Math professional development on the SAVVAS curriculum will be provided by Dawn Fulton, Mathematics TSA.
BEST Standards professional development will be provided by Jessica McMillan, State Regional Literacy Director.

IReady professional development will be provided three times this year.
Our RtI Facilitator will provide professional development on Tier II and Tier III strategies.
Book Study for 3rd-5th teachers on Notice & Note Reading Non-Fiction. The new reading series utilizes Notice and Note. This will provide teachers with a deeper understanding of Notice and Note.
Book Study Pre-K-2nd teachers on the Heggerty Curriculum and Phonemic Awareness.

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

We will continue to track the data for our AR program and offer the level incentives. Our math committee will continue to brainstorm ways to increase math fluency such as a multiplication bee. We will continue to monitor our data by having grade level data meetings and student data chats.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our overall ELA Achievement has been our lowest performance areas. On AP3 data for 2020-2021, our Students With Disabilities ESSA subgroup had a proficiency achievement level of 25% and our African American/Black ESSA subgroup had a proficiency achievement level of 20%. According to the 2020-2021 AP3 data, both of these subgroups were below the 41% mark. However, our overall ELA achievement for the 2021 FSA results had a proficiency level of 67%.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will go from 25% on the AP3 data to 50% or higher on the 2022 FSA school wide for the Students With Disabilities ESSA subgroup. ELA proficiency will go from 20% on the AP3 data to 50% or higher on the 2022 FSA school wide for the African/Black ESSA subgroup. ELA overall achievement for the 2022 FSA will have a proficiency level of 70% or greater.
Monitoring:	Data from STAR 360 will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups. Data from iReady will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed. School administration, the data teacher leader, and the guidance counselor will meet with each grade level after the STAR assessment periods. Administration will meet with the RtI Facilitator to discuss the individual needs of students in TIER II and TIER III.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Barnes (lbarnes2@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teach students the awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to The What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guides: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through Third Grade, the awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters proved to have a strong evidence on student performance. The National Reading Panel (NRP) report found that teaching students to recognize and manipulate the segments of sound in words (also referred to as phonological awareness) and to link those sounds to letters is necessary to prepare them to read words and comprehend text.47 Recent evidence reviewed for this guide supports the NRP's conclusion. The ability to isolate sounds and then link those sounds to letters will help students read about 70 percent of regular monosyllabic words, such as fish, sun, and eat. 48 The system for linking sounds to letters is referred to as the alphabetic principle. To effectively decode (convert from print to speech) and encode (convert from speech to print) words, students must be able to 49: • identify the individual sounds, or phonemes, that make up the words they hear in speech • name the letters of the alphabet as they appear in print • identify each letter's corresponding sound(s) According to the What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guides: Improving Reading Comprehension Kindergarten Through Third Grade, good readers use many forms of thinking and analyzing text as they read. It is therefore important to teach beginning readers strategies for constructing meaning from text.13 A strategy is the intentional application of a cognitive routine by a reader before, during, or after reading a text (see box on page 11). Comprehension strategies help readers enhance their understanding, overcome difficulties in comprehending text, and compensate for weak or imperfect knowledge related to the text. The strategies may be taught one by one or in combination. Both approaches can improve reading comprehension, so the panel recommends that teachers choose the approach they are most comfortable with in the classroom. Teachers

should also help students learn how to use comprehension strategies independently through the gradual release of responsibility.14 When releasing responsibility to students, however, be mindful that students differ in the extent of modeling or support they need from teachers in order to use strategies effectively.

Action Steps to Implement

The data team will meet with teachers to review this data and analyze individual student needs.
Jessica McMillan, State Regional Literacy Director, will provide professional development on the B.E.S.T Standards.
Teachers (Pre-K-2nd grade) will participate in a book study on the Heggerty Curriculum and Phonemic Awareness Information. Jodie Broussard, TSA with the ELA department, will lead this book study.
Teachers (3rd-5th) will participate in a book study on Reading Non-Fiction: Notice & Note. Kim Gunn, TSA with the ELA department, will lead this book study.
The Literacy Leadership Team will develop a school wide AR plan to ensure students are motivated and excited to engage in daily reading.
The RtI Facilitator and ESE teachers will use the Sonday Systems to support the needs of individual students.

Person Responsible Lisa Barnes (lbarnes2@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2018-2019, our math lower quartile was 63% compared to 59% in 2020-2021. On AP3 data for 2020-2021, our Students With Disabilities ESSA subgroup had a proficiency achievement level of 43% and our African American/Black ESSA subgroup had a proficiency achievement level of 47%. According to the 2020-2021 AP3 data, both of these subgroups were above the 41% mark. However, our overall Mathematics achievement for the 2021 FSA results had a proficiency level of 85%.
Measurable Outcome:	Mathematics proficiency will go from 43% on the AP3 data to 50% or higher on the 2022 FSA school wide for the Students With Disabilities ESSA subgroup. Mathematics proficiency will go from 47% on the AP3 data to 50% or higher on the 2022 FSA school wide for the African/Black ESSA subgroup. Mathematics overall achievement for the 2022 FSA will have a proficiency level of 80% or greater. Mathematics lower quartile achievement for the 2022 FSA will be 70% or higher.
Monitoring:	Data from STAR 360 will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups. Data from iReady will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed. School administration, the data teacher leader, and the guidance counselor will meet with each grade level after the STAR assessment periods. Administration will meet with the RtI Facilitator to discuss the individual needs of students in TIER II and TIER III.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Barnes (lbarnes2@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teach number and operations using a developmental progression.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to The What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guides: Teaching Math to Young Children, effective instruction depends on identifying the knowledge children already possess and building on that knowledge to help them take the next developmental step. Developmental progressions can help identify the next step by providing teachers with a road map for developmentally appropriate instruction for learning different skills.29For example, teachers can use progressions to determine the developmental prerequisites for a particular skill and, if a child achieves the skill, to help determine what to teach next. Similarly, when a child is unable to a grasp a concept, developmental prerequisites can inform a teacher what skills a child needs to work on to move forward. In other words, developmental progressions can be helpful aids when tailoring instruction to individual needs, particularly when used in a deliberate progress monitoring process (see Recommendation 3). Although there are multiple developmental progressions that may vary in their focus and exact ordering,30 the steps in this recommendation follow a sequence that the panel believes represents core areas of number knowledge (see Table 3).31 Additional examples of developmental progressions may be found in early math curricula, assessments, and research articles. With each step in a developmental progression, children should first focus on working with small collections of objects (one to three items) and then move to progressively larger collections of objects. Children may start a new step with small numbers before moving to larger numbers with the previous step.32

Action Steps to Implement

The data team will meet with teachers to review this data and analyze individual student needs.
Dawn Fulton, TSA with the Mathematics Department, will provide professional development on the SAVVAS curriculum.

The Mathematics Committee will develop a school wide plan to ensure students are motivated and excited to learn their number operations.

Person Responsible Lisa Barnes (lbarnes2@ecsdfl.us)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Molino Park Elementary reported 0.0 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all other elementary schools statewide, it falls into the very low category. Our faculty and staff will continue to ensure our school vision, "To promote joy in learning in a positive, safe and child-centered environment" is in place each day. Our administration and our Leadership Team will continue to monitor our discipline data.

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.

Molino Park's vision is, “To promote joy in learning in a positive, safe and child-centered environment.” Molino Park Elementary endeavors to prepare each student to be a lifelong learner and a productive citizen. We utilize current research-based educational principles and practices to facilitate maximum student performance. Our stakeholders (SAC, PTA, Leadership Team, Business Partners, Volunteers, Mentors, and our Families) play a key role such as providing feedback to our administration. As an example, our SAC members provide feedback on school improvement strategies. Molino Park's faculty, staff, and stakeholder strives everyday to build effective relationships, promote physical safety, address emotional needs of students, and provide individual academic support.

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

Our stakeholders are our faculty and staff, SAC, PTA, Leadership Team, Literacy Leadership Team, Mathematics Committee, Business Partners, Volunteers, Mentors, Families, and our community members. All of these stakeholders play an important role such as providing feedback to our administration, building relationships, promoting safety, and addressing academic and emotional needs of our individual students.

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
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00