Anthony Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Anthony Elementary School

9501 NE JACKSONVILLE RD, Anthony, FL 32617

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gay Street   Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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

Anthony Elementary School

9501 NE JACKSONVILLE RD, Anthony, FL 32617

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	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.

Anthony Elementary School will accomplish the highest academic achievement possible for our students while creating a safe and nurturing school environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that "all children can learn and succeed". We will be an exemplary learning community school. We build the foundation of this community through meaningful relationships, relevant and engaging learning, and effective communication.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnson, James	Principal	Oversee all programs and processes at the school level. Principal will have specific emphasis on monitoring school data, and progress of bottom quartile students.
Bradshaw, Saundra	School Counselor	Coordinate the MTSS process from the guidance department. Plays lead role in planning staffings, monitoring MTSS process, and facilitating youth mental health plan.
Raney, Karli	Instructional Coach	Support teachers with tier 1 instruction in all subjects. In addition Coaches will also provide support to the teachers with their tier 2 & 3 interventions as well.
Lenon, Veronica	Instructional Coach	Support teachers with tier 1 instruction in all subjects. In addition Coaches will also provide support to the teachers with their tier 2 & 3 interventions as well.
Hamby, Kendra	Assistant Principal	Lead curriculum department, and be the point person for all teachers' curricular needs. Areas of oversight to also include master schedule, master calendar, MTSS process, and staff duty responsibilities.
Smith, Jennifer	Dean	The Dean will be the point person for all things discipline, behavior management, and classroom management. Other duties will include coordination of safety/crisis committee, field trips, and staff duty assignments.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 1/4/2018, Gay Street

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.*

0

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	34	60	63	65	51	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Attendance below 90 percent	12	36	33	33	28	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	1	5	3	7	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	12	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	0	2	5	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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
Tuesday 8/11/2020

Prior Year - 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	54	68	53	89	74	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	15	11	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	7	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	15	9	17	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	29	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	12	24	15	30	39	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	54	68	53	89	74	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	15	11	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	7	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	15	9	17	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	29	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	12	24	15	30	39	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	47%	57%	47%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	50%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	53%	47%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	40%	51%	63%	47%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	38%	58%	62%	44%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	49%	51%	27%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	47%	53%	49%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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	2019	41%	44%	-3%	58%	-17%
	2018	36%	46%	-10%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	49%	-17%	58%	-26%
	2018	36%	43%	-7%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	39%	45%	-6%	56%	-17%
	2018	30%	46%	-16%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	49%	0%	62%	-13%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	34%	48%	-14%	62%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
	2018	42%	47%	-5%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	25%	45%	-20%	60%	-35%
	2018	28%	50%	-22%	61%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	44%	3%	53%	-6%
	2018	42%	49%	-7%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	12	50	53	17	47	42	23				
ELL	33	43		24	31		40				
BLK	26	51	50	23	31	31	23				
HSP	43	52		32	36		44				
WHT	50	63	45	52	44		68				
FRL	35	53	52	33	39	50	38				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	26	28	7	28	33	17				
ELL	30	44		21	25						
BLK	24	28		24	24		33				
HSP	38	36		29	36		36				
WHT	45	27	20	46	46		50				
FRL	31	30	41	30	38	26	39				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	14	29	27	21	24						
ELL	29			50							
BLK	32	43		19	41		31				
HSP	57	72		68	56		50				
WHT	49	46	46	51	42	17	57				
FRL	40	47	48	42	37	22	44				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
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	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our lowest area on the 2019 FSA was overall Math performance. Specifically, our learning gains in Math were particularly low. this trend continued during the 2019-2020 school year. Some of the factors that contributed to the low performance was the elevated emphasis on ELA due to the fact we are in the bottom 300. Also, there was a lack of a concrete plan for math intervention within the grade levels.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The only area that declined from the prior year was the math learning gains. As stated earlier, an added emphasis on ELA improvement, and the lack of a defined math intervention process contributed greatly to the decline from the prior year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The areas with the biggest gaps when compared to the state average is our overall proficiency in both ELA and Math. When looking at the FSA data from the previous year, we knew that we had to make some significant changes to our reading program, specifically our intervention programs, due to the inflated number of students that require tier 2 and 3 services. I believe that this emphasis on our reading MTSS programs led to the substantial increases in our ELA learning gains (+33%). Now, to sustain our momentum and take it to the next level, we have to focus on increasing the overall proficiency numbers. We will do this by focusing on improving tier 1 instruction, and paying special attention to the students that scored a level 2 last year on the FSA.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The area that increased the most from the previous year was ELA learning gains, trailed just barely by the learning gains of the bottom 25%. In addition to the extra intervention time afforded to us by being in the bottom 300, we also focused the majority of our PD efforts on improving our teachers' reading instruction, especially in the area of reading intervention. We also closely monitored our MTSS groups to make sure that students were placed appropriately, and receiving the correct intervention to fill their deficits.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

In looking at the EWS data, the most concerning data is the number of students that we have that represent 2 or more of those indicators. This obviously means that they have more than one barrier that is hindering them from being as prepared as they could possibly be to perform optimally in the classroom.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Improving in all areas of Math
2. Raise the proficiency percentage in both ELA and Math

3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Anthony Elementary School will increase proficiency in English Language Arts We chose ELA proficiency as an overall area of focus because data results indicated that Learning Gains increased in the area of ELA, but proficiency still fell below our goals. After further analyzing the data we realized that inconsistencies in the use of available curriculum, as well as the delivery/ implementation of the curriculum, contributed greatly to the problem.
Measurable Outcome:	If Anthony Elementary teachers consistently deliver Florida Standards aligned instruction in reading, and provide effective reading interventions, then student proficiency will increase in the following grades as measured by FSA data. Grade 3 proficiency Baseline 45%, Target 50%; Grade 4 proficiency Baseline 34%, Target 45%; Grade 5 proficiency Baseline 41%, Target 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be provided with professional development in higher-level questioning, student feedback practices, and purposeful ongoing formative assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This year instead of focusing our professional development efforts on implementation of various instructional programs, we are focusing on improving teachers' tier 1 instruction across all subjects and grade levels. Specifically we will focus on higher-level questioning, providing students with quality feedback, and implementation of purposeful formative assessment to drive future instruction.

Action Steps to Implement	
Develop professional development plan with leadership team to emphasize tier 1 goals	
Person Responsible	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Support teachers with tier 1 goals weekly, during collaboration meetings	
Person Responsible	Veronica Lenon (veronica.lenon@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor effectiveness of implementation using classroom walk through
observational data and other assessments

Person Responsible   James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Admin and/or staff attendance of Model Schools Conference

Person Responsible   Kendra Hamby (kendra.hamby@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Anthony Elementary will increase student proficiency and learning gains in Math. After reviewing multiple pieces of data and 3-year FSA trends, root cause analysis reveals that inconsistencies in the implementation of the math curriculum, and a lack of proper intervention of below-level students, contributed to the decrease in all areas of math.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers use data driven instruction, formative assessments and collaborate with leadership to develop and implement interventions, then Math proficiency will increase in the following grades as measured by FSA data. Grade 3 Baseline 53% Target 53% Grade 4 Baseline 36% Target 50% Grade 5 Baseline 26% Target 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be provided with professional development in higher-level questioning, student feedback practices, and purposeful ongoing formative assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This year instead of focusing our professional development efforts on implementation of various instructional programs, we are focusing on improving teachers' tier 1 instruction across all subjects and grade levels. Specifically we will focus on higher-level questioning, providing students with quality feedback, and implementation of purposeful formative assessment to drive future instruction. In addition to these strategies, we will also provide the teachers with a concrete plan for Math intervention to be used daily in their classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement	
Develop professional development plan with leadership team to emphasize tier 1 goals	
Person Responsible	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Support teachers with tier 1 goals weekly, during collaboration meetings	

| **Person Responsible** | Veronica Lenon (veronica.lenon@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Monitor effectiveness of implementation using classroom walk through observational data and other assessments

| **Person Responsible** | James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Develop intervention plan specifically for Math to be used by teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Kendra Hamby (kendra.hamby@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Admin and/or staff attendance of Model Schools Conference

| **Person Responsible** | Kendra Hamby (kendra.hamby@marion.k12.fl.us) |

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Anthony Elementary will increase proficiency in all ESSA subgroups that are currently under 41%, specifically SWD and African American Students We chose to specifically address the needs of our Students with Disabilities and African American Students due to the fact that their percentage of proficient students fell below the 41% threshold.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers focus on differentiation during Tier 1 instruction and interventions, then subgroups with a federal index below 41% will increase as follows: SWD from 35% to 38% and AA from 34% to 37% as measured by ESSA Federal Index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In addition to the professional development given to all teachers to improve overall tier 1 instruction, we will also provide teachers specifically with strategies to use to be able to better differentiate their instruction for the various subgroups that are struggling on campus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe that if teachers do a better job of differentiating their tier 1 instruction, as well as their interventions, to better meet the needs of our students; then overall performance of our struggling subgroups will improve markedly.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop professional development plan with leadership team to
emphasize differentiating to meet the needs of our struggling subgroups

Person Responsible	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Support teachers with these goals weekly, during collaboration
meetings

Person Responsible	Veronica Lenon (veronica.lenon@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor effectiveness of implementation using classroom walk through
observational data and other assessments

Person Responsible	James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Admin and/or staff attendance of Model Schools Conference

Person Responsible	Kendra Hamby (kendra.hamby@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Our areas of focus should be enough to address the school improvement priorities listed in our needs assessment.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:
• A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
• Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
• Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
• Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
• Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
• Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
• Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/ or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

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

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**