

Marion County Public Schools

Harbour View 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Harbour View Elementary School

8445 SE 147TH PL, Summerfield, FL 34491

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Joy Baxley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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 (46%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Harbour View Elementary School

8445 SE 147TH PL, Summerfield, FL 34491

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at Harbour View Elementary is to create an innovative environment where all children, regardless of differences, will excel. We are dedicated to excellence in education so that each child will become a productive citizen in an ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are dedicated to excellence in education so that each child will become a productive citizen in an ever-changing world.

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
Baxley, Joy	Principal	Lead teachers, support Collaborative Planning, manage resources, allocate budgets, increase student proficiency
Pollard, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Place students, support teachers in collaborative planning, monitor testing, analyze and share data, manage interventions - placement and training, PMP meetings
Light, Vera	School Counselor	support teachers and students, run small groups by need, train and support Caring School Community, support PBIS
Nettles-Brown, Jannissa	Dean	Support PBIS, manage discipline, train and support classroom management, schedule and execute safety drills, manage referrals and consequences, manage Tier 2 and 3 behavior students
Salem, Sheri	Instructional Coach	Math program fidelity and data, math intervention training and placement, support collaborative planning, teach as needed, coach as available.
Swinehart, Charolette	Instructional Coach	ELA program data, support collaborative planning, intervention training, placement and fidelity, PMP decisions, support collaborative planning, teach as needed, coach as available
	School Counselor	support teachers and students, run small groups by need, train and support Caring School Community, support PBIS

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Joy Baxley

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

740

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

20

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

13

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	134	141	123	150	98	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	768
Attendance below 90 percent	64	55	43	57	35	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300
One or more suspensions	7	13	11	18	21	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Course failure in ELA	23	20	54	20	12	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Course failure in Math	14	15	44	35	7	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	59	38	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	72	42	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	3	6	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	25	50	39	12	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/18/2022

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	126	120	120	111	123	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	738
Attendance below 90 percent	63	62	52	66	63	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
One or more suspensions	8	6	7	5	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA	19	17	50	34	16	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
Course failure in Math	13	15	49	40	13	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	8	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	19	21	55	48	26	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	126	120	120	111	123	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	738
Attendance below 90 percent	63	62	52	66	63	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
One or more suspensions	8	6	7	5	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA	19	17	50	34	16	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
Course failure in Math	13	15	49	40	13	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	8	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	19	21	55	48	26	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

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	1	0	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	37%	46%	56%				43%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	46%						52%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						42%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	41%	50%	50%				46%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						51%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						41%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	53%	59%				51%	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	38%	44%	-6%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	42%	49%	-7%	62%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	45%	6%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	44%	7%	53%	-2%
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	18	49	45	23	47	35	5				
ELL	28	43	53	31	65	54	23				
BLK	20	42		16	58		27				
HSP	35	50	50	38	69	63	33				
MUL	43			36							
WHT	40	45	35	46	58	40	50				
FRL	33	46	41	36	58	54	39				
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	19	36	47	24	63	64	10				
ELL	23	67		27	67		20				
BLK	28	45		28	50		30				
HSP	35	64		36	70		39				
MUL	29			47							
WHT	42	51	47	47	72	63	55				
FRL	29	42	43	34	66	65	39				
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	19	30	28	27	43	42	22				
ELL	25	30	9	32	41	38	36				
BLK	34	47		35	53		20				
HSP	40	41	26	41	48	41	45				
MUL	40	56		46	33		40				
WHT	45	58	48	50	53	47	59				
FRL	37	50	42	40	49	46	43				

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	47
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

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	44
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	33
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	49
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
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	46
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?

All tested grade levels struggle to meet proficiency expectations, especially 4th grade ELA. 5th grade Math proficiency dropped from 56% to 46%. We have the same underperforming subgroups as in the past, with African-American, Multi-racial, and Students with Disabilities.

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

ELA Proficiency shows the greatest need for improvement, especially in 3rd and 4th grades. FSAA data in Math and Science showed significant decreases, thus a huge opportunity for improvement.

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

Tier 1 Instruction is not rigorous enough, nor is there adequate planning for instructional delivery strategies and student engagement because the collaborative planning process is ineffective. Time is spent planning what to teach, rather than HOW to teach it, so our focus will shift. We will also be taking more regular looks at data, and using that data to drive the planning process.

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

3rd Grade ELA and Math, and 4th grade Math showed the greatest increase in proficiency. Third grade math increased 3 points, from 31% to 34% proficient. Fourth grade math went from 34% to 38% proficient, an increase of 4 points. Third grade ELA showed the greatest increase of 5 points, from 31% to 36% proficient.

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

The dedication and determination of the third grade team to ensure student growth and working towards reducing the number of retainees had a significant impact. In addition the team was very cohesive and worked well in collaborative planning and were a proactive team.

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

We will restructure collaborative planning to focus on instructional delivery strategies and student engagement. Ensure that teachers come prepared. Norms will be established and roles assigned to improve the planning process. The end product document will be adjusted to include the engagement piece in a very concrete way. Teachers will need to understand the new benchmarks, and use the district provided lesson plans for large group instruction, so as to focus on small group differentiation.

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 re-train for collaborative planning, and regular faculty meetings will include the modeling and/or practice of engagement structures.

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

We will continue to build our Dolphin culture of adult learners who see the benefits of teamwork, sharing the responsibilities for students achievement across all levels, especially with our youngest, non-tested student, to make sure our foundation grows stronger each year.

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.

Data indicators show that ELA proficiencies dropped significantly in 4th grade, from 38% proficient to only 27%. 3rd grade reading proficiencies are well below 50%, at only 36% proficient, and 5th grade is at 43% but made no improvement from the prior year.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

State the specific measurable

outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will increase our overall ELA proficiency on the BEST by 4 percentage points, from 37% to 41% by June 2023. Third grade will increase from 36% to 41%, 4th grade from 27% To 41%, and 5th grade will maintain a proficiency of 43% or higher.

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

We will monitor ELA instruction through collaborative planning, classroom observations, intervention fidelity checks, PMP meetings, iReady data, and district assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

We are using the evidence based strategies of teacher student relationships, and direct instruction.

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

We selected these strategies because of their high effect sizes, which are .72 and .59 respectively. We believe that relationships must precede relevance, and that relevance must precede rigor. As teachers develop relationships with students, they will not only be able to address basic physical need for food and safety, but determine some possible motivators for students so that behaviors can be reduced and the focus shifted from management to instruction. If the relationship is strong, students will feel free to

selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

participate in collaborative learning structures that follow the tier 1 direct instructional delivery, thus increasing the probability of learning.

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.

Schedule and support regular collaborative planning with CASs and admin, with some district support as available.

Person

Responsible

Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Create and enforce norms for collaborative planning with faculty so we can be present, prompt, prepared, polite and purposeful. Relate norms to our schoolwide expectations and have all contribute to their creation and elaborate on them.

Person

Responsible

Jennifer Pollard (jennifer.pollard@marion.k12.fl.us)

Shift the focus of collaborative planning from WHAT to teach, to HOW to teach, with a focus on rigorous task aligned to standards, and specific strategies for instructional delivery and student engagement. We will refrain from using collaborative planning as information sharing meetings, and instead focus on addressing what our data tells us.

Person

Responsible

Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

PBIS was rolled out last year, and progress was made on the Benchmarks of Quality. However, referrals were still up, and we are ready for next steps in implementation. This will include regular sharing of discipline data, and the rollout of a token economy system to include training for students and adults on the use of Dolphin Dollars and the Dolphin Depot, as well as quarterly PBIS events.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Discipline referrals will decrease by 5%, from 674 referrals to 640 or less, as measured by the discipline pivot table at the end of May 2023. In addition we will reduce the severity of offenses to 0 Level 4 referrals, and reduce the number of Level 3 offenses by 10% from 23 to 20 using the same measurement

Monitoring:

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

Monthly discipline data pivot table review with administration team and faculty, monthly PBIS data review with faculty.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jannissa Nettles-Brown (jannissa.nettles-brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We will use direct instruction and teacher-student relationships to affect these changes a. Mrs. Baxley will review expectations each week on the morning show for all students, and teachers will review procedures in the classroom as the beginning of the year and at intervals following several days out of school. Mrs. Brown, our dean, will use time in the cafeteria with all students to go over code of conduct, expectations and consequences for particular behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Direct instruction has a .59 effect size index, and teacher-student relationships has a .74 effect size. Mrs. Baxley and Mrs. Brown have access to a captive large audience on television and through the cafeteria, and teachers will build relationships because they understand the connection to academic success.

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.

We will be intentional about getting staff on board with next steps in PBIS implementation, namely, the use of a token economy. They will be trained, and we will model the process, as well.

Person Responsible Jannissa Nettles-Brown (jannissa.nettles-brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students will participate in a survey to determine the types of quarterly PBIS events they would like to work for.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Dolphin Depot will be stocked for regular shopping by students, and manned by community volunteers.

Person Responsible Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

PbIS Committee will schedule and advertise the Depot shopping days and quarterly events

Person Responsible Jannissa Nettles-Brown (jannissa.nettles-brown@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

iReady AP3 data shows that less than 50% of students in 1st and 2nd grade are proficient in ELA.

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

FSA data indicates that more than 50% of students in grades 3-5 are not proficient in reading.

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)

By May 2023, i-Ready AP3 data will show that 50% or more of our 1st and 2nd graders are proficient or showing on or above grade level in reading.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By June 2023, BEST assessment data will show that at least 50% of our students in grades 3-5 will score at a proficient level 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.

We will monitor through classroom observations, intervention fidelity checks, i-Ready progress monitoring, and intermittent district assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Baxley, Joy, joy.baxley@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?

We will be using computer programs that are evidence based and approved by the district, such as i-Ready, IXL, Smarty Ants, as well as district approved interventions that are also evidence based such as myFocus, Heggerty, Language Power, SIPPS, Read Naturally, Lexia Core and Read 180. They are selected and approved by the district precisely because they do align to the BEST standards and with our K-12 Reading

plan. Computer programs will be monitored by regular checking of available reports, and intervention programs will be monitored by regular fidelity checks. Subgroups of intervention students will be set up within computer programs so that progress monitoring is more specific.

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?

Programs selected are identified and vetted by the district, and approved because they address specific needs and have proven records of effectiveness for the targeted student groups.

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
Literacy Leadership team will be formed and regular meetings set. Teachers who need Literacy Coaching will be identified and a coaching plan developed and implemented.	Swinehart, Charlotte, charlotte.swinehart@marion.k12.fl.us
Professional development will be provided to teachers who are delivering certain interventions will receive training through PD on Demand in the MCPS portal, from CAS's, and from company representatives when appropriate.	Baxley, Joy, joy.baxley@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.

We are continuing to implement PBIS, monitoring our Benchmarks of Quality to share and celebrate areas with a score of 3, and addressing areas of weakness. Our expectations are clearly posted in areas around campus. They are reviewed regularly on the morning show with the entire school, as well as by the dean in the cafeteria, and by teachers in classrooms. Teachers use Caring School Community to build classroom culture and relationships with and among students.

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

ALL persons in our school and community are stakeholders. We need to train teachers on PBIS and support them in its implementation, and assist parents in understanding their role and how they can support our school culture with their actions at home, by understanding the difference between home and school rules, and by sharing specific things parents can do to help their students be successful not just in school, but in life! Community partners in the Villages are on board with and supporting PBIS by contributing inventory to the Dolphin Depot and providing volunteers to run the store and support quarterly PBIS events.