Fessenden Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fessenden Elementary School

4200 NW 89TH PL, Ocala, FL 34482

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Stacie Newmones   Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2018

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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: F (25%)
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

Fessenden Elementary School

4200 NW 89TH PL, Ocala, FL 34482

[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	71%

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.

Fessenden will build and foster positive working relationships and a learning environment that is student-centered and includes a community of citizens that are excited, committed, and motivated in the belief that all of our students are capable learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fessenden staff will continually develop as professionals in order to adapt to the academic, emotional, and social needs of ourselves and our students.

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
Redd, Lacy	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. The employee in this position supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school and reports to the assigned administrator.
Ponder, Angela	Assistant Principal	To aid the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Fernandez, Christine	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the area of literacy, utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning.
Stokes, Moneshia	Math Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of math and science, utilizing effective professional development practices to build the capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning.
Camp, Marlene	School Counselor	To coordinate a Comprehensive School Counseling Program for all students leading to academic success, career awareness, social/personal development, community involvement, and multicultural/global citizenship development.
Shawley, Aimee	Dean	Implementation of PBIS and handles all discipline

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/12/2018, Stacie Newmones

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

390

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

8

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

7

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	63	65	64	75	61	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	403
Attendance below 90 percent	23	36	25	26	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	10	15	5	11	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in ELA	36	34	34	20	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Course failure in Math	17	25	18	16	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	29	17	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	23	30	21	20	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	58	58	59	64	72	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	24	26	18	30	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	3	3	4	1	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	2	15	23	15	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in Math	1	6	13	7	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	14	16	11	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	58	58	59	64	72	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	24	26	18	30	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	3	3	4	1	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	2	15	23	15	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in Math	1	6	13	7	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	14	16	11	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%	47%	56%				30%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	61%				50%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	51%	52%				55%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	43%	54%	60%				31%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	49%	62%	64%				43%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	55%				57%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	17%	42%	51%				29%	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	24%	44%	-20%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	49%	-9%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2022					
	2019	31%	45%	-14%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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	37%	49%	-12%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	15%	54%	-39%	64%	-49%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2022					
	2019	36%	45%	-9%	60%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	31%	44%	-13%	53%	-22%
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	26	33		16	25						
ELL	30	42		39	48		17				
BLK	40	60	64	30	33	23	9				
HSP	37	47	50	47	59		21				
WHT	37	36		56	59		29				
FRL	32	50	72	37	48	42	14				
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	13			25							
ELL	35	54		43	62		45				
BLK	33	47		27	37		21				
HSP	44	50		46	56		43				
WHT	46	71		38	23		42				
FRL	35	48	55	32	36		30				
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	35		14	31						
ELL	35	44		38	35		18				
BLK	19	50	50	21	41	47	19				
HSP	29	52		35	41		24				
WHT	44	50		42	49		53				
FRL	23	49	56	29	47	58	24				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
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	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	43
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	43
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?

Fessenden continues to struggle with low reading proficiency with 38%, although this number has steadily risen from 26% since 17-18. Gains were successful with 50% showing a years gain, 64% Lower Quartile showed gains. Math proficiency is higher at 43%, 49% gains and 41% Lower Quartile Gains. Science proficiency was very low at 17%. Fifth graders were very low readers. Math data indicates 25% of SWD students achieved learning gains and 33.3% of black students achieved learning gains. Lower quartile data in math indicates only 23.1% of black students had learning gains.

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

The greatest need for improvement continues to be building foundational reading skills so that students come up into the tested grades as readers. Reading proficiency continues to be low at 38%. Science proficiency of 22% directly tied to low readers in 5th grade with only 25% proficient. Math data indicates a focus needs to be on black and students with disabilities.

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 in 3,4,5 continue to come up into the testing grades with foundational skill deficits in reading and math. The fifth graders showed the biggest concern last year with only 25% proficient in ELA and 28% proficient in Math and 22% proficient in science. The school struggles to fill all classes with certified teachers. 5th Grade ELA was taught by a substitute all year. Improving foundational skills across the board in our primary grades will help the number of students proficient. Continued recruitment of qualified staff is needed.

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

4th Grade ELA improved from 37% to 55%. 4th Grade Math improved from 31% to 56%.

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

The students in the 4th grade cohort from last year, and 5th grade this year had a very stable quality primary experience and came into the upper grades more proficient readers with stronger foundational skills.

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

Continuing to analyze the students' data, fill gaps in instruction, and work on the automaticity of reading and math computation. Extending the math block to 3rd 1 hour 10 mins, 4th 1 hour 20 minutes, and 5th 95 minutes. Focusing on collaborative structures across all content to raise engagement.

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.

Teachers provided professional development in intervention programs, collaborative structures, and how to support reading across the content areas. Professional development in the new math series and through deep discussion in collaborative planning, ensure all teachers understand how to the math concepts.

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

Observations of fidelities of programs, coaching cycles on teachers with needs, and monitoring of new staff.

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.**	Effective Collaborative Planning is our priority goal in order to ensure that our teachers are able to plan and implement standards-based instruction in their classrooms with the rigor and depth needed to achieve mastery. This will be done by developing norms, roles and responsibilities, purpose, and a focused calendar. Determining what students need to know and be able to do. Determining how to reteach when not mastered and enrichment for those who have mastered.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our targets are at least 45% ELA proficiency on all assessments, 48% math proficiency on all assessments, and at least 30% proficiency on all science assessments.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	All assessment data will be analyzed by the administrative team. Weekly walk-throughs of classrooms and tracking of teacher feedback will occur.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacy Redd (lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Implementation of Collaborative Planning Elementary Protocol. The admin team will provide specific feedback on instruction through coaching.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	We believe collaboration has the power to build a staff capable of planning and carrying out lessons that are standards-based and have rigor. Continually focused on improving our instructional practices along with monitoring of data. Professional development will also build their knowledge base.

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.

Norms, Roles & Responsibilities, Purpose, and Focus Calendar developed.

Person Responsible   Moneshia Stokes (moneshia.stokes@marion.k12.fl.us)

During Collaboration, a review of the agenda, norms, and responsibilities will occur. The team will identify what students need to know and be able to do. How will we know they learned it? What they will do when students haven't learned it? What will teachers do when they already know it? Discuss how to review, accelerate, and intervene.

Person Responsible   Christine Fernandez (christine.fernandez@marion.k12.fl.us)

The administrative team will observe collaboration as well as the implementation of plans. Provide specific, timely feedback to teachers and coaches through coaching. This information will be tracked and documented.

Person Responsible   Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Mathematics data indicate low proficiency for SWD students 15.8% and for Black students 30% compared to their peers (43% total) Gain data indicates only 25% of SWD students making learning gains and 33.3% of black students making learning gains. Low 25% data indicate only 23.1% of black students making learning gains in math.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Mathematics proficiency data on FAST at the end of the year will increase the percentage of proficient Black students from 30% to 40%. Mathematics proficiency data on FAST at the end of the year will increase the percentage of proficient SWD students from 15.8% to 25%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	FAST, as well as all internal assessment data, will be monitored for the above goals in proficiency in mathematics. Collaborative Planning sessions will be observed and professional development monitored by the administration weekly. The teacher feedback log will record feedback on the MTR model.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Through Collaborative Planning sessions weekly, the Math Coach will demonstrate high-yield teaching strategies, provide differentiated professional development, and model the instruction of the math content in order to build the capacity of the instructional staff. She will also work with paraprofessionals to ensure their knowledge of math instructional strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Through observation of instruction and teacher feedback, the staff struggles with math content knowledge.

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.

A collaborative structure is put in place weekly for 50 minutes with the Math coach.

Person Responsible	Moneshia Stokes (moneshia.stokes@marion.k12.fl.us)

Each collaborative planning session will include high-yield teaching strategies, modeled use of manipulatives, and a focus on Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards MTR. Instructional staff will understand the MTR model to promote deeper learning and understanding of mathematics.

Person Responsible	Moneshia Stokes (moneshia.stokes@marion.k12.fl.us)

Data meetings will be held that focus on proficiency, including a specific focus on Black and SWD students. These meetings will be monitored by the administration. Teachers that indicate low data will be

observed more frequently and given specific feedback on their instruction, as indicated by the teacher feedback log.

Person Responsible   Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@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

Focus on Foundational Skills to support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 2nd grade through the implementation of UFLI Foundations through a partnership with the University of Florida Literacy Initiative.

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

Implementation of Collaborative Planning Elementary Protocol
Admin team provide specific feedback on instruction through coaching

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)

Improve phonics survey data by 15%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

All assessments at least 45% proficiency in ELA

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.

After each assessment, data analysis will indicate areas of improvement or need including by subgroup and teacher.

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

Redd, Lacy, lacy.redd@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?

UFLI Foundations is an evidenced-based phonics and phonemic awareness program designed to support our reading programs. It aligns with the district's K-12 comprehensive reading 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?

Data indicates a large need for reading proficiency focus with 3rd 36%, 4th 56%, and 5th 25% reading proficiency data.

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
1. K-2 Teachers trained on UFLi program	Redd, Lacy, lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us
Teachers observed for fidelity of implementation and provided specific feedback as indicated on teacher feedback log and fidelity sheets.	Fernandez, Christine, christine.fernandez@marion.k12.fl.us
Data Analysis after each core phonics survey assessment to monitor growth and plan for any areas of weakness	Redd, Lacy, lacy.redd@marion.k12.fl.us
Professional Development planned for teachers needs as identified through coaching plans	Redd, Lacy, lacy.redd@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.

Through Collaborative Planning, all members of teams will feel valued and supported. Through the use of norms and procedures, all members will have voices at the planning table, encouraged and supported as they grow their educational toolbelts. Coaches will model and support quality instruction in a non judgmental way that allows educators to grow and learn comfortably. Specific feedback will be individualized and tracked to ensure all members are growing in their skills.

All parents and visitors will be welcomed. Translators will be on hand for in person events and all flyers and invites will be also printed in spanish. All parents will be invited to be a part of SAC and PTO and given opportunities for input.

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

We believe all members on our campus help support our learning environment. The Admin team, instructional coaches, teachers and paraprofessionals are work to improve the use of effective teaching to improve student achievement. Parents and students are valued stakeholders and will be given opportunities to give feedback through climate surveys and through SAC and PTO meetings.