

Marion County Public Schools

Greenway 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

Greenway Elementary School

207 MIDWAY RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Leann Mcearchern

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

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

Greenway Elementary School

207 MIDWAY 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 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	67%

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.

It is the mission of Greenway Elementary to inspire all students to become successful citizens in the community by maintaining high expectations for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Greenway Elementary will provide an educational environment where each individual in the school community is valued, respected, and encouraged to be a lifelong learner.

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
McEarchern, Leann	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.
Manzanares, Patricia	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is mainly responsible for the overall academic and administrative responsibilities and oversees curriculum, preparing students' and teachers' schedules, ordering textbooks and supplies, and assisting in maintaining a safe and orderly school environment. Assists in the development, implementation, and evaluation of intervention programs that address the needs of at-risk students. The assistant principal also performs a variety of administrative duties to assist the Principal in managing the school; assumes the duties of the Principal in the absence of the Principal and as assigned. Assists the Principal in providing instructional leadership to the school.
Boland, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Facilitates the professional and intellectual development of teachers and aides. Helps to build positive relationships between teachers and administrators. Communicates, implements, and demonstrates practices in instruction that are known to improve teaching and education in general. Communicates information between students, teachers, administrators, and the community in general. Works with teachers to find effective ways to deal with behavioral issues in the classroom. Puts various tutoring programs into place and recruits teachers to host them.
Howell, Margaret	Instructional Coach	Facilitates the professional and intellectual development of teachers and aides. Helps to build positive relationships between teachers and administrators. Communicates, implements, and demonstrates practices in instruction that are known to improve teaching and education in general. Communicates information between students, teachers, administrators, and the community in general. Works with teachers to find effective ways to deal with behavioral issues in the classroom. Puts various tutoring programs into place and recruits teachers to host them.
Fortner, Peggy	Dean	Supervises and evaluates the performance of designated certificated and/or classified personnel; assigns duties to faculty and staff as appropriate to meet school objectives; assists with the recruiting, interviewing, and selection of new faculty and staff. Develops and administers disciplinary procedures in accordance with district policies and state laws; receives referrals and confers with students, parents, teachers, community agencies, and law enforcement; responds to and resolves parent, student, and staff concerns and complaints; serves on discipline or expulsion panels as assigned. Supervises students on campus before and after school; monitors students during lunch, recess, passing periods, and other

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		activities; instructs students in appropriate behavior; disciplines students in accordance with established guidelines. Monitors and organizes attendance functions; prepares letters, calls parents, and attends meetings as needed regarding absent or tardy students; provides leadership for attendance improvement efforts.
Page, Ashley	School Counselor	Assist faculty, staff, and students in the areas of social-emotional learning, MTSS, and MDT.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/28/2021, Leann Mcearchern

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

700

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

14

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

15

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	117	107	112	125	93	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	687
Attendance below 90 percent	59	47	48	45	31	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	279
One or more suspensions	9	4	12	22	17	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Course failure in ELA	20	30	38	21	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
Course failure in Math	18	22	31	28	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	30	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	29	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	4	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	24	27	38	34	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154

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	2	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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

Thursday 7/28/2022

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	110	89	100	104	116	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	70	36	24	36	37	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	237
One or more suspensions	6	2	3	6	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	17	25	17	12	12	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Course failure in Math	17	22	14	9	12	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	21	22	17	14	23	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	110	89	100	104	116	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	70	36	24	36	37	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	237
One or more suspensions	6	2	3	6	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	17	25	17	12	12	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Course failure in Math	17	22	14	9	12	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	21	22	17	14	23	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145

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	2	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	44%	47%	56%				39%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	61%				48%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	51%	52%				47%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	47%	54%	60%				42%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	57%	62%	64%				43%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	55%				42%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	42%	51%				40%	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	39%	44%	-5%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	49%	-8%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	45%	-11%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

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	51%	49%	2%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	25%	45%	-20%	60%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	39%	44%	-5%	53%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	25	40	48	30	43	32	18				
ELL	42	43	25	32	64	71	25				
BLK	35	67	73	35	43	33	25				
HSP	45	48	38	46	66	72	40				
MUL	40	38		48	50						
WHT	48	54		54	54		47				
FRL	41	52	43	43	57	59	31				
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	17	29	27	15	21	18	25				
ELL	23	33		18	15		18				
BLK	25	21	18	25	33	25	19				
HSP	35	47	25	33	31		36				
MUL	33			43							
WHT	46	48		40	39		57				
FRL	35	36	24	32	31	27	41				
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	9	39	45	16	41	50	20				
ELL	25	40	33	33	36	39	33				
BLK	27	46	65	19	26	43	19				
HSP	34	43	28	41	49	52	45				
MUL	32	50		53	60						
WHT	48	54	48	53	43	21	44				
FRL	32	45	47	35	42	51	21				

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	49

ESSA Federal Index	
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	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	43
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	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	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	51
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	45
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?

School-wide data is below 50% proficiency in both ELA and Math. However, overall proficiency scores increased from 2020-2021 in both ELA and Math. (Plus 8% in ELA and plus 13% in Math) The third graders showed the most improvement with 52% proficiency in ELA and 57% proficiency in Math. Fourth grade had 42% proficiency in ELA and 44% proficiency in Math. Fifth grade had 38% proficiency in ELA and 37% proficiency in Math.

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

An analysis of 2021-2022 i-Ready Progress Monitoring data demonstrated large deficits in proficiency in grades First through Fifth. (All below 50% in Reading and Math) Furthermore, the state assessment data shows that we still have work to do in the areas of ELA and Math proficiencies.

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

The pandemic continued to have a negative impact on student learning. Many teachers and students were quarantined and missed valuable instructional opportunities. As a result, deficits are evident across all grade levels. To address the need for improvement, there will be a school-wide focus on professional learning. We will implement a monthly professional learning session on the fourth Wednesday of every month. There will also be professional development opportunities during the weekly collaboration meetings. Finally, we will offer differentiated professional learning sessions on a voluntary basis.

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

According to state assessment data, the third grade ELA and Math achievement scores showed the most improvement increasing by 17% in ELA (35% to 52%) and 34% in Math (*23% to 57%).

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

We implemented school-wide collaborative planning twice weekly. The collaborative sessions offered targeted support in ELA and Math instruction.

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

We will offer mandatory professional learning opportunities for our staff. The fourth Wednesday of every month will be dedicated to professional development. We will also use our collaborative planning sessions to promote professional learning. We will offer optional professional learning opportunities throughout the school year.

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.

We will offer a variety of professional learning opportunities for teachers and leaders to build their capacity. The trainings will address Intervention programs, district curriculum, B.E.S.T benchmarks in ELA and Math, Tier 1 best practices for instruction, family engagement, and Tier 1 behavior supports.

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

The leadership team will ensure that students, staff, and teachers are held accountable for all required tasks. We will continue to hold twice-weekly collaborative planning sessions. We will offer differentiated professional learning opportunities and support all school stakeholders.

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 Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

ELA and Math proficiency is below 50%, as measured by the Florida State Assessment (FSA).

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we provide instructional staff targeted professional learning opportunities to build their capacity in ELA and Math instruction and continue to hold twice-weekly collaborative planning sessions, then our overall proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase by 6% for ELA and Math.

K-5: i-Ready ELA/Math Diagnostic AP1 August 2022, AP2 January 2023, and AP3 May 2023

3-5: District Benchmark Testing in ELA and Math

3-5: 2023 F.A.S.T ELA / Math Proficiency

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will participate in weekly data meetings with the leadership team in collaboration to monitor student progress on standard mastery through formative assessments. They will also meet quarterly after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps to intervene and respond to the assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

Teachers will participate in monthly Professional Learning Communities to build instructional capacity in the areas of ELA and Math. Teachers will also participate in twice-weekly collaborative planning sessions.

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 who participate in Deliberate Practice have the potential to accelerate student achievement with an effect size of .82.

According to Hattie's Teaching and Learning Strategies, teachers who participate in Collaborative Planning have the potential to accelerate student achievement with an effect size of .79.

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 participate in monthly professional learning sessions. The sessions will be led by our Instructional Coaches, district experts, or school-based administrators. The ongoing professional development will assist teachers in building their instructional practice.

Teachers will participate in an ELA and Math collaborative planning session each week. The ELA and Math Content Area Specialist (CAS) will lead the sessions, provide resources, and assist with determining professional development needs.

The leadership team will conduct instructional rounds to look for improved instructional practice. The

instructional rounds will provide information to the leadership team to support additional professional learning sessions.

Person Responsible

Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@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

We will implement the UFLI Foundations program with fidelity.

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

We will implement vetted Intervention programs to help students close learning gaps.

Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS)

Read Naturally

Read 180

Lexia Core

myFocus Intervention (Savvas)

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 we implement the UFLI Foundations program with fidelity in grades K-2, then we will increase the number of students measuring early, mid, or on grade level by 10%. (As measured by i-Ready)

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

If we implement vetted intervention programs with fidelity for grades 3-5, then we will increase the number of proficient students by 10%, as measured by state testing.

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.

All data from the programs will be monitored monthly. Fidelity checks will be conducted monthly through binder checks and classroom visits.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Manzanares, Patricia, patricia.manzanares@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?

The evidenced-based programs align with the district's K-12 Reading plan and are on the MTSS Placement Stairs list.

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?

The evidence-based programs address the areas of student needs. (Foundational Skills, Phonics/Decoding, Fluency, Vocabulary/Comprehension)

Action Steps to Implement:

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Professional Learning-Teachers will be trained to use the programs with fidelity.	Boland, Rebecca, rebecca.boland@marion.k12.fl.us
The instructional Coach will provide coaching and modeling to teachers to ensure that programs are implemented properly.	McEarchern, Leann, leann.mcearchern@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.

School staff, families, and volunteers work together to promote a safe environment and positive school culture. School staff will promote a positive learning environment with the implementation of the Caring School Community SEL program and the continuation of the PBIS program. The faculty and staff will hold parent nights to build trusting relationships and build the capacity of caregivers and students. The

Greenway administrative team will promote a positive school culture by often communicating, celebrating success, and supporting all school stakeholders.

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

Teachers provide a positive learning environment where students feel safe to learn the standards while they teach students how to work socially with one another. Students can build positive life skills as they learn to work well with others and learn skills for their future. Our families provide their children with the tools necessary for optimal learning, such as positive partnerships with the teacher and administrators. Parents partner in learning by attending school parent trainings and conferences, utilizing district resources like Skyward Family Access and the District Title I Parent Resource Center to support learning. Volunteers contribute by working directly with students and teachers and supporting learning by helping in the classrooms. School Advisory Council (SAC) members support the school goals by providing feedback and support to the school leadership team. Lastly, Greenway's business partner plays a key role in building positive school culture and the environment by providing resources such as school supplies, help for our families in need, and volunteering to work with our students.