Anthony Elementary School

2022-23 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: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 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	48%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		C	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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Street, Gay	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader by overseeing all academic initiatives for Anthony Elementary. She supports instruction by facilitating collaboration and being present during classroom instruction. Furthermore, she provides consistent, quality learning opportunities for staff in an effort to enhance instructional practices and optimize resources. These efforts will in turn yield optimum learning opportunities for learners resulting in improved academic success for students.
Hamby, Kendra	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal provides support for the vision and leadership of the principal by supporting Tier 1 instruction and learning opportunities. The assistant principal supports the collaborative process and follows through by seeing it through to impact during instruction. She provides coaching and learning opportunities for staff which yield enhanced instructional and learning opportunities.
Arnold, Veronica	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach supports the staff and administration by serving as a content area expert. She supports instruction via co-teaching and coaching opportunities. Furthermore, she supports collaboration by serving as a content area expert and provides feedback and guidance in the development of high quality, Tier 1 instruction.
Ostanik, Kelly	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach supports the staff and administration by serving as a content area expert. She support instruction via co-teaching and coaching opportunities. Furthermore, she support collaboration by serving as a content area expert and provides feedback and guidance in the development of high quality, Tier 1 instruction.
Bennett, Samantha	Dean	The student services manager supports the overall academic goals of the school by providing organizational and behavioral management. She provides discipline support and serves as classroom management coach.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Gay Street

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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

25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

362

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	71	67	70	67	57	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	391
Attendance below 90 percent	28	23	26	29	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	8	6	10	3	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	21	20	18	14	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in Math	21	19	15	11	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	17	18	21	14	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Tuesday 7/19/2022

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	67	65	61	67	53	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	385
Attendance below 90 percent	27	13	20	21	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	7	3	1	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	4	15	10	17	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in Math	11	13	10	11	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	14	14	13	17	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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

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	67	65	61	67	53	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	385
Attendance below 90 percent	27	13	20	21	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	7	3	1	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	4	15	10	17	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in Math	11	13	10	11	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	14	14	13	17	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	47%	47%	56%				41%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	56%	61%				56%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	51%	52%				50%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	45%	54%	60%				40%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	62%	62%	64%				38%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	55%				41%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	42%	51%				49%	47%	53%

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**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	41%	44%	-3%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	32%	49%	-17%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	45%	-6%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	25%	45%	-20%	60%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	47%	44%	3%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	25	67	50	19	50	36					
ELL	8			33							
BLK	33	55	56	33	59	64	26				
HSP	41	75		44	67						
WHT	58	71		53	63		56				
FRL	42	69	68	42	64	57	33				
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	18	19		25	7		18				
ELL	15			31							
BLK	26	40		31	44		25				
HSP	37	27		36	29		31				
WHT	43	42		51	41		50				
FRL	32	43		38	45	31	37				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	60
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

In the area of proficiency for ELA, the data improved for the 2021-22 school year from 38% to 47%, netting a 9% increase in grades 3-5. During the 2020-21 school year, the proficiency level dropped to 38%, and the 2019-20 school year, resulted in a 3% increase to 41% proficiency and dropped in the 2018-19 school year by 4% resulting in 37%.

In the area of proficiency in Math, the data for the last four school years indicated a continued cycle of improvement as the math proficiency continues to trend upward. In 2017-18 school year, the proficiency was at 34%, 2018-19 it increased 6% to 40%, 2019-20 it increased to 44%, and again in 2021-22, the math proficiency increased by 1% resulting in 45% proficiency.

Science proficiencies for 5th grade remain uneven from one year to another, however, the last two years, the data has resulted in a consistent upward trend increasing from 40% in 2020-21 to 43% in 2021-22.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data indicates that the greatest area of need is proficiency in ELA, math and science. In ELA, student
proficiency achievement improved from 38% to 47% in the 2021-22 school year, however the data remains below the state average of 55% by 8% percentage points. FSA data reveals that in ELA, third-grade achievement levels were 12% lower than the state average of 53%. Fourth-grade achievement was 10%
lower than the state average of 57% proficiency. Fifth grade was 4% below the state average of 55%.

In math, third grade was 10% below the state average of 58% resulting in 54% of the students identified as non-proficient. In fourth grade, the achievement average was 51% and the state average was 61%, resulting in a 10% gap and 49% of the students were non-proficient. Lastly, fifth-grade math

achievement was 39% which was significantly below the state average 52%. Sixty-one percent of the fifth grade students were non-proficient in math.

Science proficiency data indicates 56% of the students were not proficient resulting in a 44% proficiency which is 4% below the state average.

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

Some factors that contribute to the need of improvement in ELA, Math and Science proficiency include the lack of standard/benchmark based and task aligned resources, curriculum, and lesson planning. Utilizing collaborative planning to the maximum will assist in improving planned lessons to meet the new BEST benchmark/standards.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data that showed the most improvement included ELA proficiency, the learning gains among all students and the learning gains among the bottom quartile in both ELA and in math.

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

Factors that contribute to this improvement include purposeful, small group support by personnel during instructional time and the extra MTSS targeted instruction based on the extra hour.

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

Strategies to implement that will accelerate learning include purposeful small group instruction and a revision of the collaborative planning process. During the collaboration, there will be a focus on content that is aligned to the BEST standard, engagement, task alignment and pacing, which will enhance Tier 1 instruction. Further, the use of benchmark clarification during collaboration and planning will ensure that instruction and tasks are appropriately aligned to the benchmark/standard. These efforts will yield higher student achievement and proficiency.

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.

Professional development opportunities will target in on BEST benchmark/standards in Tier 1 instruction (the instructional core, including task alignment, engagement, and pacing), and formative assessment for the purpose of data-based instructional decisions that will yield purposeful small group, standards/benchmark based instructional opportunities.

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

The administration and the instructional coaches will support our collaborative planning.
Teachers will be supported during collaboration, while all instructional items are appropriately vetted. The use of benchmark/standard clarifications will be used to support the teacher in understanding the benchmark/standard. The collaborative process will be facilitated and guided by the administration and instructional coaches to ensure adequate learner engagement and pacing. Additionally,

the administration and coaches will inspect the implementation of the lessons during instruction, seeking evidence of collaboration, and will provide feedback and coaching as needed.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Effective Tier 1 instruction which is aligned to the BEST benchmark/standards is the top priority based on the 2021-2022 proficiency data. This is the first year of implementation of the BEST benchmark/standards for grades 3-5; therefore we will need to build capacity for teachers. Our 2022 ELA iReady progress monitoring data shows the following percent of grades K-2 students not proficient in their current grade level 70% of Kindergarten, 88% of 1st grade, and 76% of 2nd grade. During the 2021-2022 school year, our ELA FSA data shows that 41% of our upcoming 4th graders and 47% of our upcoming 5th graders are not proficient. Increasing the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction will result in increased ELA proficiency among learners.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	If we provide students with effective ELA instruction that is aligned to the benchmark/standard including meeting the benchmark/standard clarifications, and formative assessments then proficiency will increase at least 5% in each grade level. Grades K-2 Using the FAST K-2 data, we will increase proficiencies from 30 % to 40% in Kindergarten, 12% to 30% in 1st grade, and 40% in 2nd grade will be proficient. Grades 3-5 According to the 2022 ELA FSA, 47% of the students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher. Of our upcoming 4th graders this school year, 41% scored a 3 or higher, and 47% of our upcoming 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2023 ELA FAST, 48% of 3rd grade, 46% of 4th grade, and 52% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher (5% higher for each grade level).
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor student proficiencies by using the FAST for grades K-5 (three times a year) in Math and ELA. In addition, we will use the district "Benchmark Assessments" grades 3-5 in ELA and Math. Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. During classroom walk throughs, teachers will receive feedback from administration in regards to instruction aligned to the benchmark.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus will be enhancing formative assessment of instruction and tasks that are aligned to the BEST standards during direct instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

It is the first year of BEST standard/benchmark for grades 3-5 in ELA and the data from last year's iReady K-2 indicate low performance across the board which shows a need to better understand the benchmark/standards.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional development will be provided to instructional staff on effective strategies for conducting formative assessment during tier 1 instruction. Further, professional development will hone in on instructional decisions based on data gathered during formative assessment.

Person Responsible   Gay Street (gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The behavioral and social emotional needs of our students is an important component to our student success. During the 2021-2022 school year, Anthony processed 395 discipline referrals. Of those referrals, fifty one percent of referrals were representative of inappropriate and disruptive conduct, mainly in the classroom setting. In addition, of the 395 referrals, 48 students received 3 or more office discipline referrals. Support is needed for our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to decrease the number of referrals which will result in more time on task for students. Providing social and emotional support to our students and families will assist with increasing student mental health and well-being which will result in increased student achievement, parent involvement, and a decrease in office referrals.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, Anthony will see a reduction in students who have more than 3 office discipline referrals by 25%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The (MDT) multi-disciplinary team meets bi-weekly to review discipline and SEL data, and to develop individualized plans for social emotional or behavioral support for our students identified as needing tier 2 or tier 3 support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kendra Hamby (kendra.hamby@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Anthony will implement district approved social emotional and behavioral support interventions that will focus on the specific needs of each child identified by the Multi Disciplinary Team as needing tier 2 or tier 3 supports.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for	Individualized social emotional and/or behavioral support plans, that utilize district approved programs (Stop and Think, Mentoring, CICO, etc.), will be developed and implemented. Data will be consistently collected and analyzed/reviewed at each MDT meeting.

selecting this strategy.

Review BESS survey data, monthly discipline referrals, threat assessments, and violence risk referrals during the MDT meetings. After the data review, small groups, or one on one, mentoring and/or counseling sessions will be implemented and progress monitored.

Person Responsible   Saundra Bradshaw (saundra.bradshaw@marion.k12.fl.us)

Establish systems for MDT processes and protocols (including schedule, meeting norms and agendas).

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

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our focus is on Improving Tier 1 instruction that is aligned to the BEST benchmark/standards. On the 2022 i-Ready AP 2; 30% of our kindergarten students were proficient, 12% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 24% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. Data collected from the FAST (PM 1, PM2 and PM3) will show improvement in proficiencies (K 41%, 1st 58%, and 2nd grade 30%). Instructional alignment was identified as a critical need from the data.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our focus is on improving Tier 1 instruction that is aligned to the BEST benchmark/standards. According to the 2022 ELA FSA, 47% of the students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher. Of our upcoming 4th

graders this school year, 41% scored a 3 or higher, and 47% of our upcoming 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2023 ELA FAST, 48% of 3rd grade, 46% of 4th grade, and 52% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher (5% higher for each grade level). Instructional alignment was identified as a critical need from the data.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

On the 2022 i-Ready AP 2; 30% of our kindergarten students were proficient, 12% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 24% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. Data collected from the FAST (PM 1 , PM2 and PM3) will show improvement in proficiencies (K from 31% to 41%, 1st from 48% to 58%, and 2nd grade 20% to 30%) by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

On the 2022 ELA FSA, 47% of the students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or higher. Of our 3rd grade students 41% scored 3 or higher, 47% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 51% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2023 ELA FAST, 46% of 3rd grade, 49% of 4th grade, and 56% of 5th grade will be proficient by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:
K-5 FAST PM1, PM2 and PM3
3-5: District Benchmark Assessments
Classroom Walk Through Data

Teachers will participate in data meetings as part of the weekly collaborative planning with the administration and Coaches and after each FAST progress monitor assessment to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Street, Gay, gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is enhanced systematic and explicit instruction for the purpose of improved tier 1 instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Systematic and explicit tier 1 instruction will enhance instructional and learning opportunities and will thus yield maximum student learning.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Develop and implement professional learning opportunities that hone in on tier 1 needs. Tier 1 instruction will be consistently evaluated to identify trends and complete needs analyses. The data collected from tier 1 instruction observations will help determine focus and objectives for professional learning opportunities. Upon implementation, follow up will occur to inspect transference of intended skills to the classroom.	Street, Gay, gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us
The Anthony Literacy team will meet monthly to evaluate student literacy assessment data (District Progress Monitoring Assessments, FAST assessments and i-Ready) and classroom observation data. This information will be used to determine the literacy focus and a plan for supported literacy coaching, based on needs, will be devised. The literacy coach will serve as the literacy leader by supporting tier 1 literacy instruction by coaching and modeling for teachers.	Street, Gay, gay.street@marion.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

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.

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

The key stakeholders with a role in promoting a positive school culture and environment at the school include the Principal and Leadership Team, the teachers and staff, the parents, and the students. Each one of these groups plays a key role in promoting that positive culture. The Principal and Leadership Team are responsible for creating a culture where positivity is valued, and negativity is not given a chance to grow. They can do this by leading by example. The teachers and staff can also promote that positive culture by ensuring that the culture in their particular classroom or area is positive in nature. It stands to reason that if all of the "mini-cultures" in the school are positive, then the overall culture will be positive as well. Next, the parents can contribute to the overall environment by supporting the personnel at school as they build a positive environment. Finally, the students contribute by following all school expectations and also being good influences on their peers.