

Marion County Public Schools

# Emerald Shores Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Emerald Shores Elementary School

404 EMERALD RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Stacy Houston**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (36%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Emerald Shores Elementary School

404 EMERALD RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

### 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.**

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

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

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

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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
Houston, Stacy	Principal	MCIES Observations; Summative Evaluations for Instructional & Non-instructional employees; Crisis Management; CIMS/SIP; Budgets; PFEP; Staff Discipline; Staff Handbook; Parent Handbook; SAC/PTO; Community Liaison.
Cabrales, Maria	Assistant Principal	MCIES Observations; MTSS - Behavior plans & PSTs for specified students; PMP meetings; Assist in preparing staff for ALICE & Fire drills; MDT Team; Materials management - textbook inventory & distribution, chromebook carts, destiny; Threat assessment referrals; Enter PD courses in TNL; Safety Chair; Volunteer approval; Testing Coordinator; SAC & PTO.
Swain, Angela	Assistant Principal	MCIES Observations; Pre-K Point Person; MTSS -Academic PMPs & PSTs for specified students; Curriculum - PK - 5th grade; 3rd Grade Portfolios; Skyward Gradebook - Report Cards/Interim Reports; Award's & Graduation Ceremonies - Planning, organization, & ordering; EOY Student sorts & assist IPC with student scheduling in Skyward; Elementary Testing Coordinator; 504 Meetings & ESOL Staffings; Weekly INformer Creation & Panther Press; Kagan Coaching (Structure of the month); Update Sharepoint; SAC/PTO.
Duplessis, Jenna	Instructional Coach	Model & provide classroom support/coaching for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; i-Ready Monitoring for math; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for math; MTSS Interventions coordinator; Enter math data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various math programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for para-professionals; Implement & monitor data folders for math.
Maio, Brittany	Instructional Coach	Model & provide classroom support/coaching for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; i-Ready Monitoring for reading; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for ELA; MTSS Interventions coordinator; Enter reading data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various reading programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for paraprofessionals; Implement & monitor data folders for reading; Literacy Committee; Lead ITD.
Melendez, Estela	Instructional Coach	Model & provide classroom support for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for science; Enter science data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various science programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for paraprofessionals; schedule and provide hands-on labs with 3-5 classes on a bi-weekly basis.
Ewart, Samantha	School Counselor	Guidance Services; IEP Staffings as needed; MTSS; Campus Life Changer / SEL; School Liaison for outside agencies; DCF calls; MDT Meeting Coordinator; Suicide Risk; Coordinate & Organize Donations; Counseling



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Groups; Holiday Assistance; Food Backpacks; 504 Contact; CUME Folder Reviews; Monitor Attendance/Tardies; ESE Students - Tier 3; Gifted, Academic, Mental, & Behavioral Referrals.
Nereim, Matthew	Dean	Discipline; Cafeteria Supervisor - train paras; Assist in preparing staff for ALICE & Fire drills; Distribute Crisis Management plans; PST Meetings for Discipline; Transportation/Bus safety issues; Model & support teachers with Classroom Management; ISS Facilitator; Threat Risk Referrals; Alternative Placements/Expulsions; Patrols.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/19/2022, Stacy Houston

**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.*

0

**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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

36

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

604

**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.**

11

#### 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	91	110	107	112	85	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	615
Attendance below 90 percent	52	43	38	51	41	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271
One or more suspensions	18	35	22	79	21	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	234
Course failure in ELA	7	11	8	14	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	5	9	9	11	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	21	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	27	28	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	26	33	33	21	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168

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	14	32	28	62	35	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226

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	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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

Wednesday 8/3/2022

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	91	109	99	96	96	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	54	49	41	45	38	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271
One or more suspensions	2	8	7	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	18	23	30	21	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
Course failure in Math	19	21	36	17	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	22	24	34	23	27	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	91	109	99	96	96	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	54	49	41	45	38	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271
One or more suspensions	2	8	7	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	18	23	30	21	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
Course failure in Math	19	21	36	17	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	22	24	34	23	27	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	42%	46%	56%				34%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						52%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	75%						58%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	50%	50%				32%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						42%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						35%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	25%	53%	59%				34%	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	32%	49%	-17%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	34%	45%	-11%	56%	-22%
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	35%	49%	-14%	62%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	64%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					
	2019	25%	45%	-20%	60%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

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	17	48	58	26	57	64					
ELL	40	91		42	91						
BLK	33	51	71	40	48	43	20				
HSP	49	75		55	65		29				
MUL	41	79		36	54						
WHT	43	55	60	57	69		33				
FRL	38	60	78	45	59	63	19				

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	10	21		3	25						
ELL	17	50		33	30						
BLK	20	27		9	21	30	5				
HSP	42	45		38	36		26				
MUL	32	67		21	27						
WHT	43	41		46	37		35				
FRL	31	37	37	24	27	29	15				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	56	65	20	45	50	33				
ELL	26	57		41	43		30				
BLK	23	48	55	23	40	30	20				
HSP	40	53	58	38	40		29				
MUL	30	39		27	39						
WHT	43	60	58	35	46	50	48				
FRL	30	50	59	28	41	33	28				

### 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	53
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
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	44
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	53
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	53
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	51
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?

Emerald Shores made gains in all 7 components of school grade ranging from a 4 point increase in Science to a 34 point increase in the lowest quartile learning gains for ELA. All sub-group data increased proficiency in reading and math.

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

Science Proficiency was only at 25%.

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

Students non-proficient in Science lack the understanding of science vocabulary. Specific lessons based around science vocabulary.

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

- ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains = +34 points
- Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains = + 30 points
- Math Learning Gains = + 30 points

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

Targeted action plans based on specific students. Administrators monitored the plans every 2 weeks and provided feedback to teachers on their implementation.

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

Continue the implementation of targeted action plans and monitoring with feedback every 2 weeks.

#### 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.

All professional development will focus on UDL during collaborative planning and on family engagement strategies.



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

Additional professional development and support will be provided to first and second-year teachers through our Cub Cadre' group that meets once monthly.

### **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.

Proficiency rates in ELA and Math increased but are at 42% and 50% in each area. Tier one planning and instruction remain a focus.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

If we continue to provide all instructional staff professional learning focusing on intentional standards-based planning, how to effectively collect and use formative assessment data, and ongoing coaching in UDL, then our overall ELA and math proficiency in grades 3-5 as measured by FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking) will increase by 5% from 42% to 47% in ELA and by 5% from 50% to 55% in math.

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

Members of the administrative team will each be assigned to participate in grade-level planning. Each administrator will monitor the planning by doing weekly walk-throughs for their assigned grade levels and provide specific feedback related to the implementation of the collaborative planning sessions. District and state data will also be used to monitor classroom and student needs. Grade level Assignments: Cabrales - 3rd & 5th grades; Houston - Kindergarten & 1st grades; and Swain - 2nd & 4th grades.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

BA's (Benchmark Assessments), DPMA's (District Progress Monitoring Assessments), and the state FAST (Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking) progress monitoring assessments will be used throughout the year to monitor classroom and student needs.

### 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."

### 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.

1. Creation of a master schedule to support uninterrupted ELA and Math blocks that include time for small group instruction based on group and individual needs and a time for all team members to meet at least 2 times per week for collaborative planning in ELA and Math.
2. Members of admin. the team attends all collaborative planning sessions for assigned grade levels and then do walk-throughs in those subject areas the following week, providing specific growth feedback.
3. Analyze all district & state data provided to create targeted action plans for groups of students and to determine the coaching needs of instructors.

#### Person

#### Responsible

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

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

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

Students with disabilities were the only sub-group below the 41% required on the Federal Percent of Points Index, scoring at 39% proficient.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

If we continue to provide all instructional staff professional learning focusing on intentional standards-based planning, how to effectively collect and use formative assessment data, and ongoing coaching in UDL, then our overall ELA and Math proficiency for our students with disabilities as measured by the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) will increase by 5% from 39% to 44%.

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

Members of the administrative team will each be assigned to participate in grade-level planning. Each administrator will monitor the planning by doing weekly walk-throughs for their assigned grade levels and provide specific feedback related to the implementation of the collaborative planning sessions. District and state data will also be used to monitor classroom and student needs. Grade level Assignments: Cabrales - 3rd & 5th grades; Houston - Kindergarten & 1st grades; and Swain - 2nd & 4th grades.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

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

BA's (Benchmark Assessments), DPMA's (District Progress Monitoring Assessments), and the state FAST (Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking) progress monitoring assessments will be used throughout the year to monitor the needs of our Students with Disabilities.

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

In 20-21, all our sub-groups were below the 41% index, and we had so much success last year using the same type of strategy with all other subgroups. We just need to make a point of creating specific action plans for our Students with Disabilities.

**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.

1. Creation of a master schedule that provides maximum support from Inclusion teachers providing targeted small group instruction to students with disabilities.
2. Inclusion teachers will be scheduled to attend collaborative planning sessions for the grade levels they work with. Administrators will provide specific growth feedback to both the Inclusion teacher and the regular education teacher in the inclusion classrooms.
3. Teams will analyze all district & state data provided to create targeted action plans for students with disabilities that do not show progress, and this data will be used to determine the coaching needs of instructors.

**Person****Responsible**

Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@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 71%
- First Grade 38%
- Second Grade 43%

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

58% of students in grades 3-5 at Emerald Shores 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.

Houston, Stacy, stacy.houston@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 the state, district, and classroom data.</p>	<p>Houston, Stacy, stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership: The school-based literacy leadership committee will meet monthly to discuss the progress towards the goals.</p>	<p>Houston, Stacy, stacy.houston@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.**

1. Teachers will receive professional development throughout the school year centered around the Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships.
2. Teachers will start to build relational trust with families at the very beginning of the school year by calling families, introducing themselves, and taking time to listen to families about their children..
3. The school utilizes Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram as a means of positive communication within the community.
4. Administration sends out a weekly Skylert message called the Panther Press to families every Sunday evening updating families on important weekly events.
5. The school has partnered with the following community-based stakeholders: Kiwanis Club of Marion County; Junior League of Marion County; the Early Learning Coalition of Marion County; and the Children's Alliance of Marion County.
6. The Home School Liaison that will continue to make daily calls to families of absent students to determine needs and provide support.



7. Our school will hold 2 different Family Conference events sharing school-wide and individual student data with families and building capacity with families for supporting learning at home.
8. Teachers will implement lessons from the Caring School Community SEL curriculum daily to support student SEL needs.

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

Principal - lead the organization by providing transparent communication and using the established core values, school mission, and vision as the basis for all decision making, and building capacity with staff members to recognize the value of families as equal partners in their children's learning.

A-team members (Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselor, Student Service Manager, and Content Area Specialists) - support the school's core values, mission, and vision by helping the Principal lead.

Teachers - create a vision and implement class-wide goals that are communicated with students regularly. Communicate with families through weekly newsletters, classroom dojo, email, and phone to create a partnership that will support student needs.

Non-instructional staff - support teacher needs in the classroom.

Office staff - provide a positive and welcoming environment for families when they visit the school.

Family Members - provide voice and perspective from the home and community.