

Marion County Public Schools

Emerald Shores Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Emerald Shores Elementary School

404 EMERALD RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Stacy Houston

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (37%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Emerald Shores Elementary School

404 EMERALD RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[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 KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

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.

As a team, we will build a respectful, supportive community focused on clear communication, consistent expectations, and engaging learning opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To inspire and motivate students to become compassionate, productive, and honest citizens within our society.

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
Houston, Stacy	Principal	MCIES Observations; Summative Evaluations for Instructional & Non-instructional employees; Crisis Management; CIMS/SIP; Budgets; PFEP; Staff Discipline; Staff Handbook; Parent Handbook; SAC/PTO; Community Liaison.
Ewart, Samantha	School Counselor	Guidance Services; IEP Staffings as needed; MTSS; School Liaison for outside agencies; DCF calls; MDT Meeting Coordinator; Suicide Risk; Coordinate & Organize Donations; Counseling Groups; Holiday Assistance; Food Backpacks; 504 Contact; CUME Folder Reviews; Monitor Attendance/Tardies; ESE Students - Tier 3; Gifted, Academic, Mental, & Behavioral Referrals.
Maio, Brittany	Instructional Coach	Model & provide classroom support for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; i-Ready Monitoring for reading; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for ELA; MTSS Interventions coordinator; Enter reading data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various reading programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for para-professionals; Implement & monitor data folders for reading; Literacy Committee,
Ricks, Marcia	Dean	Discipline; Positive Panthers Committee Chair; Cafeteria Duty - train paras; Assist in preparing staff for ALICE & Fire drills; Distribute Crisis Management plans; PST Meetings for Discipline; Transportation/Bus safety issues; Model & support teachers with Classroom Management; ISS Facilitator; Threat Risk Referrals; Alternative Placements/Expulsions; K-Kids; Patrols.
Rowe, James	Assistant Principal	MCIES Observations; Discipline - point person; MTSS - Behavior plans & PST's for specified students; Assist in preparing staff for ALICE & Fire drills; MDT Team; Materials management - textbook inventory & distribution, chromebooks carts, destiny; Threat assessment referrals; Enter PD courses in TNL; Safety Chair; Volunteer approval; Facilitation of staff furniture moves; SAC & PTO.
McPhee, Monica	Assistant Principal	MCIES Observations; Pre-K Point Person; MTSS - Academic PMP's & PST's for specified students; Curriculum - PK - 5th grade; 3rd Grade Portfolios; Skyward Gradebook - Report Cards/Interim Reports; Award's & Graduation Ceremonies - Planning, organization, & ordering; EOY Student sorts & assist IPC with student scheduling in Skyward; Elementary Testing Coordinator; 504 Meetings & ESOL Staffings; Weekly INformer Creation & Panther Press; Kagan Coaching (Structure of the month); Update Sharepoint; SAC/PTO.
Ashberger, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Model & provide classroom support for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; i-Ready Monitoring for math; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for Math; MTSS Interventions coordinator - math; Enter math data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		teachers with various math programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for para-professionals; Implement & monitor data folders for math; Career Day Coordinator; Math Committee Chair.
Fortner, Peggy	Instructional Coach	Model & provide classroom support for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for Sci.; Enter science data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various science programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; STEAM Showcase Coordinator; Title 1 Parent Liaison; Science Committee Chair.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Stacy Houston

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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*

	Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (37%)
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	70	125	107	99	98	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	24	21	16	18	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	17	16	13	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA	0	2	7	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	8	12	19	27	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	1	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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 8/17/2020

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	100	102	85	104	118	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611
Attendance below 90 percent	24	21	16	18	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	15	34	42	47	60	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	255
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	11	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	58	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168

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	16	32	41	36	58	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	100	102	85	104	118	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611
Attendance below 90 percent	24	21	16	18	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	15	34	42	47	60	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	255
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	11	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	44	58	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168

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	16	32	41	36	58	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	34%	47%	57%	48%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	56%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	52%	53%	51%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	32%	51%	63%	44%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	42%	58%	62%	43%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	49%	51%	21%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	47%	53%	32%	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	35%	44%	-9%	58%	-23%
	2018	35%	46%	-11%	57%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	49%	-17%	58%	-26%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	33%	43%	-10%	56%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	34%	45%	-11%	56%	-22%
	2018	35%	46%	-11%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	35%	49%	-14%	62%	-27%
	2018	28%	48%	-20%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	54%	-16%	64%	-26%
	2018	33%	47%	-14%	62%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	25%	45%	-20%	60%	-35%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	61%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	44%	-11%	53%	-20%
	2018	39%	49%	-10%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	17	56	65	20	45	50	33				
ELL	26	57		41	43		30				
BLK	23	48	55	23	40	30	20				
HSP	40	53	58	38	40		29				
MUL	30	39		27	39						
WHT	43	60	58	35	46	50	48				

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
FRL	30	50	59	28	41	33	28				
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	14	35	42	17	41		27				
ELL	39	43		39	29						
BLK	25	34	36	31	38	31	46				
HSP	35	34	40	37	35		39				
MUL	35	38		25	38						
WHT	46	40		40	46	40	60				
FRL	34	37	26	34	41	34	45				
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	28	48	43	27	33						
ELL	47			63							
BLK	42	57	36	35	44	21	16				
HSP	43	65		49	47		18				
MUL	31			38							
WHT	59	51	36	49	42	25	53				
FRL	46	60	50	42	41	15	28				

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	46
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	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
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	49
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	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	45
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.

The lowest performance from the 2019 school year was in Math Achievement. EMS earned 32 percentage points for students in 3rd - 5th grade scoring a Level 3 or above. There were several contributing factors that could account for the lack of growth in this area. They include: school-wide focus was in all areas of reading based on previous year's declines; math coach was teaching in a class for the majority of the school year due to teacher openings for the entire year; new teachers in both 4th and 5th grade that were teaching math and learning math content.

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

The subject area that showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 was in science with a 12 point decrease. We had 2 new teachers to 5th grade teaching the science standards and this was a different cohort of students. The same cohort of students were at 32% proficient in the area of reading in the 2018 school 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 area that had the largest gap when compared to the state average was in Math Achievement which had a 31 percentage point gap. There were several contributing factors that could account for the lack of growth in this area. They include: school-wide focus was in all areas of reading based on previous year's declines; math coach was teaching in a class for the majority of the school year due to teacher openings for the entire year; new teachers in both 4th and 5th grade that were teaching math and learning math content.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was the lowest quartile of students making learning gains in ELA. The actions that occurred last year that assisted in these positive gains include: early intervention protocols for all students in reading; consistent monitoring of reading interventions to include flexible changes based on data; and additional hour utilized daily to provide reading interventions to students below grade level.

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

The number of one or more suspensions along with number of students at a 90% or below attendance average are huge concerns for the upcoming year. If students are not in school, how can they learn.

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

1. Increasing percentage of students scoring a level 3 in reading.
2. Increasing percentage of students scoring a level 3 in math.
3. Increasing the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in the area of reading.
4. Increasing the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in the area of math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing the percentage of students scoring a level 3 in reading & math. By identifying all of the students scoring a Level 2 in reading and math and providing intense interventions as well as actively monitoring their progress in these subject areas the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 in reading will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers create and implement an effective learner environment that is engaging and aligned to learner needs, then 80% of the 5th graders scoring a Level 2 on the 2018-2019 FSA in reading and in math will increase their score to at least a level 3 on the 2020-2021 FSA in the area of reading.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students scoring a Level 2 on the previous year's FSA will receive intense interventions based on their immediate weakness in the area of reading or math by a highly qualified teacher for 90 minutes per day for reading and 40-45 per week for math. The intervention will be monitored for effectiveness and every 6 -8 weeks a determination will be made to continue the intervention or if changes need to be made.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:	This was the strategy used in the previous school year for all students in the area of reading and we had 52% of our students earn a learning gain.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze each student scoring a level 2 on the 2019 reading & math FSA and determine area of need in each area.
2. Place all Level 2 students in appropriate research based interventions.
3. Every 6-8 weeks review any and all data to determine if students are making gains in the area of reading.
4. Set goals with students throughout the school year.
5. Make changes to students' intervention groups as needed.
6. Provide continuing PD to all staff related to Learner Engagement. (20 day action plans are created for this.)

Person Responsible Brittany Maio (brittany.maio@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Increasing the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in the area of reading and math. By identifying all of the students scoring in the bottom quartile in reading & math and providing intense interventions as well as actively monitoring their progress in reading the percentage of students achieving a learning gain in reading should increase. This would include all 3rd grade retainees.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

If teachers create and implement an effective learner environment that is engaging and aligned to learner needs, then the percentage of students in the lowest quartile will increase from 58% to 63% in the area of reading and from 35% to 45% in the area of math as measured by the 2020-2021 FSA.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Students that scored in the lowest quartile in reading and math on the previous year's FSA will receive intense reading and math interventions based on their immediate weakness in each area by a highly qualified teacher for 90 minutes per day in reading and 30-45 minutes per week in math. The intervention will be monitored for effectiveness and every 6-8 weeks a determination will be made to continue the intervention or if changes need to be made.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

This was the strategy used in the previous school year for all students in the area of reading and we had 52% of our students earn a learning gain.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze & continue to monitor the students that will be in the lowest quartile in reading based on the 2019 reading and math FSA and determine area of need in both reading and math.
2. Place students in appropriate research based intervention(s).
3. Every 6-8 weeks review any and all reading data to determine if students are making gains in the area of reading.
4. Set goals with students throughout the school year.
5. Make changes to students' intervention groups as needed.
6. Provide continuing PD to all staff related to Learner Engagement. (20 day action plans are created for this.)

**Person
Responsible**

Brittany Maio (brittany.maio@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.

The School Level Leadership team will implement an action plan related to decreasing the percent of students with a greater than 90% absent rate.

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.

1. Teachers are required to make individual parent phone calls prior to the year beginning to communicate goals and begin to establish a positive partnership between school and home.
2. The school utilizes Twitter, Face Book, and Instagram as a means of positive communication within the community.
3. Administration sends out a weekly Skylert message to parents/guardians every Sunday evening updating families of important weekly events.
4. The school has partnered with the following community based stakeholders: Kiwanis Club of Marion County; Junior League of Marion County; the Early Learning Coalition of Marion County; and the Children's Alliance of Marion County.

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: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00