

Marion County Public Schools

College Park 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

College Park Elementary School

1330 SW 33RD AVE, Ocala, FL 34474

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Teresa Forsyth

Start Date for this Principal: 2/6/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (45%) 2018-19: C (42%) 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

College Park Elementary School

1330 SW 33RD AVE, Ocala, FL 34474

[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	83%

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.

Our mission at College Park Elementary School is to inspire students to become successful citizens in their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at College Park Elementary School is to positively impact the future by creating lifelong learners with the community in mind.

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
Forsyth, Teresa	Principal	The principal coordinates administrative oversight and plans all phases of instructional leadership, including educational programs, staff evaluation, office administration, budgetary planning, discipline, professional development, and counseling services. Ensures a productive learning environment through continual collaboration with teachers, students, parents, and community partners.
Robles, Noelle	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the school site principal, assumes responsibilities in the administration of school curriculum, instructional programs, staff development, guidance and evaluation of staff, state and district testing procedures, and general administrative functions. The assistant principal facilitates grade-level collaboration and team meetings, parent conferences, and campus event planning.
Winkler, Rebekah	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the school site principal, assumes responsibilities in the administration of school curriculum, instructional programs, staff development, guidance and evaluation of staff, state and district testing procedures, and general administrative functions. The assistant principal facilitates grade-level collaboration and team meetings, parent conferences, and campus event planning.
Brazill, Emily	Dean	Under the direction of the Principal, the Dean (Student Services Manager) serves as an instructional leader in the planning, coordination, and administration of school activities and behavior incentive programs, including student conduct, attendance, and the social-emotional behavior support program.
Wingster, Michaela	School Counselor	Provides a comprehensive school counseling program that assists all students in acquiring the skills and knowledge to maximize the highest student achievement in a safe learning environment. Confers with classroom teachers, administration, support staff, community agencies, and parents regarding students and their needs. Provides support to teachers in the delivery of the social-emotional support program and related curriculum. Coordinates with school and community agencies to broaden students' resources to support their mental and physical health.
Durrance, Ashley	Reading Coach	The Reading Instructional Coach will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective literacy instruction. In order to fulfill these expectations, the Instructional Coach will provide personalized support that is

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers in support of the school improvement action plan.
Davis, Chris	Other	The Math and Science Instructional Coach will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective mathematics and science instruction. In order to fulfill these expectations, the Instructional Coach will provide personalized support that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers in support of the school improvement action plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 2/6/2018, Teresa Forsyth

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

838

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

11

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

10

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	146	115	120	148	114	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	779
Attendance below 90 percent	63	44	53	52	39	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	299
One or more suspensions	24	15	10	20	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in ELA	22	52	37	39	14	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Course failure in Math	23	37	31	46	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	62	38	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	42	38	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	33	44	39	44	17	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	215

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 7/12/2022

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	113	122	134	113	135	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	60	43	58	33	59	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
One or more suspensions	16	3	11	7	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	25	38	48	41	45	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226
Course failure in Math	28	32	46	49	46	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	24	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	11	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	30	36	51	42	54	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	261

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	113	122	134	113	135	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	60	43	58	33	59	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
One or more suspensions	16	3	11	7	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	25	38	48	41	45	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226
Course failure in Math	28	32	46	49	46	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	24	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	24	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	11	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	30	36	51	42	54	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	261

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	40%	47%	56%				36%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	61%				49%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	51%	52%				59%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	54%	60%				43%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	50%	62%	64%				48%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	52%	55%				33%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	27%	42%	51%				28%	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	28%	44%	-16%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	24%	45%	-21%	56%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

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	38%	49%	-11%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					
	2019	29%	45%	-16%	60%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	23%	44%	-21%	53%	-30%
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	4	34	50	21	39	35					
ELL	39	56	52	51	51	38	18				
BLK	33	44	38	46	49	43	18				
HSP	44	53	50	59	47	42	25				
MUL	33	40		53	50						
WHT	37	70		49	61		50				
FRL	33	45	42	49	46	40	20				

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	6	31		20	57	70					
ELL	34	58	100	48	63	82	21				
BLK	38	61		43	36		17				
HSP	42	54	76	52	63	73	33				
MUL	18			36							
WHT	43	53		55	67		33				
FRL	37	53	65	45	54	61	24				
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	16	34	45	23	34	29	4				
ELL	31	52	50	44	56	42	18				
BLK	23	41	72	30	41	44	21				
HSP	40	51	48	47	49	31	29				
MUL	45			18							
WHT	38	55		51	57		37				
FRL	32	48	59	39	49	35	22				

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	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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	45
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	39
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	47
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	44
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 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	53
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	41
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?

Student performance using grade-level AP3 progress monitoring tools from 1st and 2nd grades placed less than 35-37% of students on grade level for reading. On the Spring 2022 FSA ELA assessment, 40% of 3rd - 5th grade students scored a 3 or higher, placing our students 15% below the state average of 55%. Only 39% of African American students scored a 3 or higher on the FSA ELA Assessment, which represents an improvement of 2% from the previous year. Student performance using grade-level AP3 progress monitoring tools from 1st and 2nd grades placed less than 32-34% of students on grade level for math. On the Spring 2022 FSA Math assessment, 54% of 3rd - 5th grade students scored a 3 or higher, placing our students 3% below the state average of 57%.

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

An analysis of 2022 AP3 i-Ready grade level data rising Kindergarten through 4th grade demonstrated a total of 58% of students trending 1 grade level below or more in their overall reading placement. Only 39% of rising 4th and 5th grade students scored a 3 or better on the FSA ELA assessment. Reading proficiency demonstrates the greatest need for improvement for first through fifth grades in the 2022-2023 school year.

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

3rd - 5th grade students demonstrated the lowest performance on the FSA ELA assessment in the cluster of Key Ideas and Details answering only 43% of the questions correctly. To answer questions relating to Key Ideas and Details, students need to be able to read grade level text, recall information from text, and summarize information learned from text. Data indicates 58% of the students at College Park are performing below grade level in informational reading comprehension strands on the iReady AP3 2022 assessment. It is important that students interact with text on a deeper level in classroom discussion and student learning tasks. Teachers will include effective questioning strategies and allow multiple ways for students to respond to text in the classroom to improve reading comprehension.

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

Overall math achievement in grades 3rd through 5th demonstrated a 5% increase to 54%, the highest overall FSA student achievement percentage since 2015.

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

Math tasks and learning activities were implemented to the depth of the standard in a gradual release model. Teachers planned collaboratively to structure the math lessons each week in the gradual release model with the student tasks developed to the depth of the rigor of the standard.

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

Teachers will plan collaboratively to include effective questioning in each ELA lesson engaging students in dialogue to extend their thinking, to provide multiple ways of responding, and to provide formative feedback that will increase learning. Hattie (2009) found an effect size of 0.46 for questioning and effective feedback with an effect size of 0.73.

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 to teach strategies to accelerate learning in math through student practice tasks aligned to the depth and rigor of the grade-level standard. Teachers will also plan collaboratively to structure worked example in mathematics using the gradual release model to scaffold or accelerate learning from the preview/introduction of the concept to the grade level depth of the standard.

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

Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home. The CPS will also provide support to teachers in additional resources as they identify both staff and student needs during collaborative planning and through parent surveys and interviews.

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 Student Engagement**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

3-5 ELA Proficiency has trended at or below 40% since 2015. The ESSA subgroup for African American students has trended below 41% for the last three FSA administrations. According to the federal index, this subgroup is currently 38%.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

If teachers use data from school-based interim grade-level assessments and the state progress monitoring system to plan Tier 1 instruction that is anchored in the high impact strategies of questioning and student feedback, the ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase from 40% to 50% on the spring 2023 end of year state assessment.

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

*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.K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic

*AP2 January 2023

*K-5: State Progress Monitoring System assessments August 2022, January 2023, and May 2023

*3-5: 2023 FSA Reading AP3 FAST assessment of proficiency

*K-5 students will participate in appropriate reading interventions that will include progress monitoring within their assigned program.

*Administrators will monitor the use of questioning in collaborative planning and classroom instruction.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Rebekah Winkler (rebekah.winkler@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

Teachers will be provided professional development in BEST standards and high impact teaching strategies to include effective questioning in each ELA lesson in order to engage students in dialogue to extend their thinking, to provide multiple ways of responding, and to provide formative feedback that will increase learning. K-2nd grade teachers will be provided professional learning in teaching foundational skills and students will learn foundational phonics skills in a format that provides multiple opportunities to respond to questioning and immediate corrective feedback that will ultimately improve reading automaticity moving into 3rd grade.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:
Explain the
rationale for**

Used effectively, questioning yields immediate feedback on student understanding, supports informal and formative assessment, and captures feedback on the impact of teaching strategies. Hattie measures the general effect size of questioning as 0.46, which is above average and within the zone of desired effects on student learning. Questioning is a flexible tool. It is used to provide feedback to students, to check for

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

understanding, and to quickly assess student progress. Feedback to students and teachers has an effect size of 0.73 (Hattie, 2009).

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.

Teachers will plan collaboratively to include effective questioning in each ELA lesson, engaging students in dialogue to extend their thinking, to provide multiple ways of responding, and to provide formative feedback that will increase learning.

K-2nd grade students will participate in daily reading foundational skills lessons through the district adopted UFLI program that will improve reading automaticity moving into 3rd grade.

Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure that vocabulary instruction is consistently administered to fidelity.

Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home which research has demonstrated has an effect size of 0.52. Resources will include support through an on-campus resources center and expanded learning classroom, family language acquisition classes, and additional literacy resources for family use at home.

Person Responsible

Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	<p>3-5 Math Proficiency was 54% in 2022 representing the highest achievement since 2015.</p>
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>If learning tasks are developed to the rigor of the BEST benchmark and delivered in a gradual release model, then student achievement in grades 3-5 will continue to grow to 60%.</p>
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>*K-5 students will participate in small group interventions using Envision math resources that will include classroom progress monitoring. *Administrators will monitor student learning tasks and exemplars used in collaborative planning and classroom instruction. *Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle below to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. *K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic AP2 January 2023 *K-5: State Progress Monitoring System assessments August 2022, January 2023, and May 2023 *3rd – 5th students will take District Progress Monitoring Assessments (DPMAs) in math. *3-5: 2023 FSA Math AP3 FAST assessment of proficiency</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Noelle Robles (noelle.robles@marion.k12.fl.us)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based	<p>Teachers will plan collaboratively to create lessons with a series of worked examples to scaffold student knowledge, promote rigorous skill acquisition, and incorporate stretch lessons to extend learning. Learning tasks will be developed to the rigor of the benchmark and delivered in a gradual release model.</p>

**strategy
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.**

Research demonstrates that worked examples are most effective when the teacher explicitly teaches the steps taken to complete the worked example and when learners use self-explanations to describe the steps to themselves and others. Research also shows that when a cycle of worked examples is used in the classroom it consists of "a problem statement and the appropriate steps to a solution. Typically the three steps include: introductory phase ("I do"), acquisition/training phase ("We do"), test phase /assess learning ("You do"). This reduces cognitive load for students such that they concentrate on the processes that lead to the correct answer and not just providing an answer. Learning is scaffolded in the I Do/We do phases and ultimately students will practice independently at the depth of the grade-level standard. The overall impact on student learning is high, measured at 0.57 in Hattie's research.

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.

Student tasks and practice activities will be created and delivered to the depth of the standard. Classrooms will be monitored to ensure the fidelity of the student work remains at the level of the standard complexity. Students will be provided exemplars to increase their understanding of particular skills and to establish standard and benchmark expectations.

Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home which research has demonstrated has an effect size of 0.52. Resources will include support through an on-campus resources center and expanded learning classroom, family language acquisition classes, and additional hands-on mathematic resources for family use at home.

**Person
Responsible** Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@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

According to i-Ready diagnostic data used to screen K-2 students in the spring of 2022, students measuring early, mid, or above on grade level are as follows:

- Kindergarten 43% (Only Mid and Above)
- First Grade 35%
- Second Grade 37%

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

60% of students in grades 3-5 at College Park scored below a level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment

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)

If students in K-2 receive explicit, systematic foundational reading skills instruction, then we will increase the number of students measuring early, mid, or above grade level by 10%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

If students in grades 3-5 receive standards-aligned instruction using grade-level text and instructional acceleration strategies, then we will be able to increase the number of students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment by 10%.

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.

State Progress Monitoring Assessments and District Benchmark Assessments will be used to monitor progress toward the desired outcome. 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. In addition, administrators will monitor the fidelity of implementation of the Foundational Skills instruction in grades K-2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Forsyth, Teresa, teresa.forsyth@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?

Students in grades K-2 will use the UFLI Foundation Curriculum to support foundational reading instruction at the Tier I level. This program is aligned with the science of reading and is supported by Just Read Florida. The instructional materials are aligned with the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

Students in grades 3-5 will use district-created lesson plans to align the adopted instructional resources to the new B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. In collaborative planning, teachers will embed high impact teaching strategies into the ELA lesson plans.

Both the curriculum and teaching strategies align with the MCPS Achieve 2026 Strategic Plan.

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?

K-2: The research based UFLI Foundation Reading Curriculum incorporates direct instruction, multiple exposures and daily feedback in the instructional routine. Direct instruction has an effect size of 0.59, Multiple Exposures has an effect size of 0.71, and Feedback has an effect size of 0.73 (Hattie 2009).
3-5: High Impact Teaching Strategies engaging students in dialogue to extend their thinking, to provide multiple ways of responding, and to provide formative feedback work together to increase learning. Questioning has an effect size of 0.46 and Feedback has an effect size of 0.73 (Hattie 2009).

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
<p>Literacy Coaching: The literacy content specialist and administrative team implement a coaching cycle to support reading instruction based on observational classroom data and results of progress monitoring from state, district, and classroom data.</p>	<p>Durrance, Ashley, ashley.durrance@marion.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership: A school-based literacy leadership team will meet monthly to discuss the progress of our school's measurable goals.</p>	<p>Forsyth, Teresa, teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us</p>

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.

School staff, families, volunteers, and our Community Partnership School work together to promote a safe environment and positive school culture. School staff will promote a positive learning environment with the second year of implementation of the Caring School Community SEL program and the continuation of our PBIS program. A committee of school staff volunteers, parents, and community workers will contribute to our multicultural events in September and February celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month and Black History Month. The school administrative team along with a committee of staff volunteers promotes a positive culture by recognizing school staff throughout the year as well as promoting themed days for both staff and students to celebrate learning in a safe environment. The administrative team, teachers, and paraprofessionals will plan and implement parent night events that will build the capacity of caregivers and students to promote a healthy socio-psychological environment and increase intellectual stimulation in the home.

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

The Community Partnership School, which includes the key stakeholders United Way of Marion County, Ocala Health, The College of Central Florida, and Marion County Public Education Foundation, leverages social and instructional capital to offer resources and services to the school. They work to improve students' well-being and success by engaging and supporting parents and the community. Their support includes school readiness, student academic success; physical, social, and emotional health, and parent and school Marion - 0651 - College Park Elementary School - 2022-2023 SIP at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Our community business partner, Meadowbrook Church, also makes both monetary and basic supply contributions, as well as providing mentors to work with struggling students. The goal of all of these stakeholders is to work with school staff to remove barriers to learning and provide built-in support so students can achieve academic success and a safe space for participants to study, learn, live, connect, and thrive.