

Marion County Public Schools

Bellevue Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Belleview Elementary School

5556 SE COUNTY HIGHWAY 484, Belleview, FL 34420

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Victoria Thomas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Belleview Elementary School

5556 SE COUNTY HIGHWAY 484, Belleview, FL 34420

[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	44%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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.

Belleview Elementary School will provide a quality learning environment where students will learn and become responsible, self-sufficient citizens who will be willing and able to become contributing members of our democratic society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students are learning to their maximum potential.

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
Thomas, Victoria	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and provide successful high-quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. Supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school.
Helfrey, Edward	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high-yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, and assists with monitoring the implementation of the intervention and necessary documentation assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specific areas.
Boireau, Ernestine	School Counselor	To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach their full potential.
Clifford, Marty	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. In addition, work with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.
Forst, Bethany	Reading Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning in the area of English/Language Arts. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students based on needs in English/Language Arts.
Flood, Trudy	Math Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals, utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning in the area of math. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on needs in Math.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/20/2021, Victoria Thomas

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.*

16

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.*

25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

574

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

5

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

9

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	114	103	108	124	78	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	34	28	38	48	32	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
One or more suspensions	9	5	7	8	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in ELA	12	41	40	61	12	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
Course failure in Math	8	30	24	47	29	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	45	15	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	44	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	15	32	33	51	23	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197

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	0	2	1	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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

Friday 7/29/2022

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	92	102	103	83	101	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	572
Attendance below 90 percent	36	32	30	36	28	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	5	5	9	8	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	8	23	44	25	14	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
Course failure in Math	10	13	32	28	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	13	17	38	30	23	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	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	92	102	103	83	101	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	572
Attendance below 90 percent	36	32	30	36	28	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	5	5	9	8	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	8	23	44	25	14	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
Course failure in Math	10	13	32	28	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	13	17	38	30	23	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	2	2	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	49%	47%	56%				36%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	61%				46%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	51%	52%				38%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	54%	60%				42%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	54%	62%	64%				58%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	55%				47%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	42%	51%				36%	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	35%	44%	-9%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

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	39%	49%	-10%	62%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					
	2019	32%	45%	-13%	60%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	33%	44%	-11%	53%	-20%
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	21	60		26	33	27	7				
ELL	37	67		48	58						
BLK	24	17		13	31						
HSP	43	66	75	48	52	38	36				
MUL	45	55		70	55						
WHT	57	67	60	54	58	52	30				
FRL	45	63	64	45	52	43	30				
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	31	53		31	59		31				
ELL	38			35							
BLK	18			32							
HSP	47	44		51	47		19				
MUL	55			60							
WHT	48	41	69	53	46	58	28				
FRL	41	38	64	49	43	59	23				
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	27	29	11	27	43	35	22				
ELL	14	35		33	35						
BLK	25	47		29	40						
HSP	20	35	20	38	50	42	10				
MUL	38			20							
WHT	42	49	43	45	64	52	42				
FRL	31	37	30	37	51	35	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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
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	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
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	21
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	48
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?

Based on the 2022 FSA ELA data, the number of students proficient in 4th and 5th grade increased from 2021 to 2022. The number of 3rd-grade proficient students decreased. Math proficiency on the FSA Math Assessment in grades 3 and 5 decreased according to the 2022 FSA data, while the proficiency increased in grade four.

Proficiency-based on the 2022 FSA ELA Assessment are the following:

3rd grade decreased by 1% from 44% in 2021 to 43% in 2022

4th-grade increase by 16% from 50% in 2021 to 66% in 2022

5th-grade increase by 6% from 36% in 2021 to 42% in 2022

Proficiency-based on the 2022 FSA MATH Assessment are the following:

3rd grade decreased by 2% from 48% in 2021 to 46% in 2022

4th grade increased by 8% from 52% in 2021 to 60% in 2022

5th grade decreased by 3% from 42% in 2021 to 39% in 2022

In the Students with Disabilities subgroup for 2022, only 29% were proficient. This is the 3rd year SWD proficiency has fallen below the federal index of 41%.

In the African American subgroup for 2022, only 21% were proficient, which is the second year this subgroup has failed to reach the federal index threshold of 41%.

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

An analysis of the 2021-2022 i-Ready proficiency data demonstrated the largest deficits in the areas of both ELA and Math for rising 3rd graders. The 2022 FSA data additionally indicated a deficit in proficiency for 3rd grade, with 43% proficient in reading and 46% proficient in Math.

FSA Data results that 43% of 3rd graders are proficient in reading
FSA Data results show that 46% of 3rd graders are proficient in math

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

The greatest contributing factor to this need for improvement is that 65% of the students entering third grade

were non-proficient in the area of phonics based on the 2021 AP3 iReady Diagnostic. In math, 67% of students entering third grade were non-proficient in Numbers and Operations based on the 2021 AP3 iReady Diagnostic.

Providing explicit phonics and foundational skill instruction during Tier 1 and small group instruction with consistency and fidelity. The action needed to improve the proficiency in Math would include teachers providing daily small group, differentiated instruction with fidelity for incoming 3rd graders and current second-grade students to close the gap prior to entering third grade.

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

ELA FSA proficiency increased by 16% in fourth grade and 6% in fifth grade.

The i-ready progress monitoring data increased in ELA proficiencies from AP2 to AP3 by 12% in fourth grade and 6% in fifth grade.

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

The contributing factor to the improvement of proficiency based on FSA and iReady data is the 4th and 5th-grade teachers' capacity to understand the depth of the standards. Most students received a double dose of grade-level standards instruction during the second block of MTSS. During collaborative planning, teachers and the CAS worked together to develop standards-based Tier 1 instruction to support the needs of all students.

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

The strategy for accelerating learning is to continue to build teacher capacity for the progression of the benchmarks and pre-requisite skills. Capacity building in the area of differentiated acceleration instruction will also be implemented.

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 will be offered during collaborative planning and Faculty Focus afternoons to address teacher pedagogy. Teachers will develop skillsets with strategies to create meaningful formative assessments, learn to choose/create student activities that are vetted and aligned to the depth and the complexity of the benchmarks and learn high-yield instructional strategies to improve Tier 1 instruction for all learners as well as acceleration instructional strategies.

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

After-school tutoring will be offered 3 days a week during the third quarter to promote proficiency in ELA and Math. Small group action plans will be developed and implemented beginning in the first quarter for students in all grade levels based on beginning and end of the year data. Data analysis will be conducted frequently during collaborative planning and meetings with teachers to determine student growth, and adjustments will be made to action plans as needed. Administration and Content Area Specialist will work collaboratively to consistently monitor Tier 1 instruction through walkthroughs and/or observations. Teachers will participate in classroom walkthroughs of model classrooms to observe quality Tier 1 and small group instruction.

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 Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

During data disaggregation, we have identified a need to improve instructional practices through Tier 1 instruction. As well as improve the development of standards-based formative assessments. The data reflects the following:

Proficiency-based on the 2022 FSA ELA Assessment are:
 3rd grade decreased by 1% from 44% in 2021 to 43% in 2022
 4th grade increase by 16% from 50% in 2021 to 66% in 2022
 5th grade increase by 6% from 36% in 2021 to 42% in 2022

In the Students with Disabilities subgroup for 2022, only 29% were proficient. This is the 3rd year that SWD proficiency has fallen below the federal index of 41%.

In the African American subgroup for 2022, only 21% were proficient, which is the second year this subgroup has failed to reach the federal index threshold of 41%.

50% of students in grades 3-5 remain non-proficient in the area of ELA based on the last two years of FSA data, 46% in 2021 and 49% in 2022.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If we provide all teachers with supported collaboration opportunities with professional development focused on developing high-yield instructional strategies during Tier 1 instruction, develop/choose productive and purposeful formative assessments and student activities that are aligned to the depth and complexity of the benchmarks, then proficiency will increase from:
 * 43% to 48% for third grade,
 * 66% to 71% for fourth grade, and
 * 46% to 51% in fifth grade
 as measured by district data analysis and F.A.S.T. state assessment.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring will take place using data from the following:

- *Administrative and CAS Walk-throughs
- *K-5 - i-Ready Diagnostic AP2 data
- *3-5 - District DPMA data
- *3-5 - District Demand Writing
- *3-5 - Benchmark Assessments
- *Weekly Formative Assessment Data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Thomas (victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy

All teachers will participate in in-depth, intentional, and purposeful student-centered collaborative planning with grade and subject area peers focused on choosing instructional strategies and activities which provide data that students demonstrate the knowledge needed to master the benchmarks.

being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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

According to Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies, "Teachers that participate in effective and intentional planning and prediction have the potential to accelerate student achievement with an effect size of .76." The article written by Carla Thomas McClure, "The Benefits of teacher collaboration" states, to determine the relationship between teacher collaboration and student achievement, the researchers used reading and math achievement scores for 2,536 fourth-graders, controlling for school context and student characteristics such as prior achievement. They found a positive relationship between teacher collaboration and differences among schools in mathematics and reading achievement."

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.

Provide collaborative opportunities twice a week for teachers to focus on the following:

- Develop and agree on A CFU or formative assessment and review the data
- Based on data, determine reteaching or reviewing opportunities and what does that look like
- Use a common lesson plan with multiple agreed-upon high-yield instructional strategies in which to choose from during instruction
- Discuss the expectations of 'What teachers will do and say and what students are to do and say during instruction.

Person Responsible

Victoria Thomas (victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

Reading and Math CAS will provide coaching, co-teaching, modeling, and data analysis support to effectively develop and implement benchmark-based Tier 1 instruction for whole group and reteaching or remediation strategies for individual student needs.

Person Responsible

Bethany Forst (bethany.forst@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the 2022 FSA Math data, overall proficiency decreased by 3% from the previous year, from 42% to 39%.
 Proficiency percentages based on the 2022 FSA MATH Assessment are as follows:
 3rd grade decreased by 2% from 48% in 2021 to 46% in 2022
 4th grade increased by 8% from 52% in 2021 to 60% in 2022
 5th grade decreased by 3% from 42% in 2021 to 39% in 2022

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If ALL teachers are provided with professional learning in the development of creating explicit teacher-led, concrete, hands-on instruction to build a solid foundation in numbers and operations, then math proficiency will increase as follows:

3rd Grade – from 46% to 51%
 4th Grade – from 60% to 65%
 5th Grade – from 39% to 44%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

*Collaborative Planning
 *Small group instruction
 *CAS Walkthroughs
 *Learning Walks
 *Admin consistent monitoring of T1 instruction

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Thomas (victoria.thomas@marion.k12.fl.us)

The following strategies will be used to support our teachers:

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

*Collaborative Planning
 *Professional Learning
 *Use of manipulatives
 *Data Disaggregation
 *CAS and Lead Teachers' Modeling
 *Co-Teach Opportunities

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

Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents 'Explicit Teacher-Led Instruction in Mathematics programs' has an effect size of 0.65. If teachers are deliberate in planning and implementing explicit Teacher-Led instruction, then proficiency will increase.

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.

During collaborative planning, teachers will use the district-created explicit lesson plans and develop benchmark-appropriate formal assessments that address the complexity and rigor of the benchmarks to drive daily instruction.

Person Responsible

Trudy Flood (trudy.flood@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

The 2022 I-Ready AP3 Diagnostic data shows the following percent of students below grade level:

Kindergarten - 12%

1st Grade - 53%

2nd Grade - 47%

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

2022 ELA FSA data shows the following percent of students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3:

3rd Grade - 53%

4th Grade - 39%

5th Grade - 61%

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 2023 progress monitoring tool, the following grade levels will increase proficiency:

Kindergarten - from 89 % to 94 %

1st Grade - from 47% to 52%

2nd Grade - from 53% to 58%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

On the F.A.S.T state progress monitoring assessment, the following proficiencies will increase:

3rd Grade - from 46% to 51%

4th Grade - from 60% to 65%

5th Grade - from 39% to 44%

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.

Monitoring will take place using data from the following:

*Administrative and CAS Walk-throughs

*K-5 - i-Ready Diagnostic AP2 data

*3-5 - District DPMA data

*3-5 - District Demand Writing

*3-5 - Benchmark Assessments

*Weekly Formative Assessment Data

*AP2 & AP3 State Progress monitoring tools for each grade level

Teachers will participate in data meetings with leadership after each testing cycle to determine progress to develop and make changes, as needed, to action plans in response to assessment results. During classroom walk-throughs, feedback will be provided to teachers based on student engagement and implementation of instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Thomas, Victoria, victoria.thomas@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. Â§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?

During instruction, the "I Do, We Do, You Do" model will be implemented at each grade level. Teachers will model and provide support for students in learning in order for students to access grade-level resources.

These scaffolds will be gradually removed as needed. Teachers will frequently provide feedback as students are learning.

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?

Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "scaffolding has a 0.83 effect size." The "I Do, We Do, You Do" scaffolds the learning process and supports students through guided practice.

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
Professional Learning will be provided to teachers in the area of scaffolding. Scaffolding will occur during collaborative lesson planning.	Forst, Bethany, bethany.forst@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.

Positive school culture and environment reflect a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationship 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 is critical.

Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners. Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment.

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

We continuously consult with our stakeholders: 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. Consulting these stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies. Teachers provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with district philosophy goals and objectives. Students' Families provide support by taking an active role in their child's education. Volunteers work with students to assist with academics while connecting the community with the school. They also provide services to the school's physical environment.