

Marion County Public Schools

Maplewood 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

Maplewood Elementary School

4751 SE 24TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christine Carter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	99%
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 (47%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Maplewood Elementary School

4751 SE 24TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[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	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

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.

Maplewood is a school where all children can learn and develop to their fullest potential. Each student's success is based upon the school, home, and community working side by side to ensure that each child will become a life-long learner and develop a sense of self worth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Side By Side For Success

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
Martin, James	Assistant Principal	Mr. Martin is responsible for curriculum and distributing resources to teachers. He also assists with professional development of teachers and paraprofessionals. He is the assessment coordinator for state testing. He also assists with professional development of teachers and paraprofessionals.
DiSanza, Christine	Principal	Ms. DiSanza provides the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The principal supervises all administrative, instructional, and non-instructional personnel assigned to the school.
Smiley, Carmen	Assistant Principal	Dr. Smiley is responsible for curriculum and distributing resources to teachers. She also assists with professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals. She assists the testing coordinator with all state assessments.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Christine Carter

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.*

6

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

71

Total number of students enrolled at the school

820

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

2

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

4

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	70	119	135	136	130	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	704
Attendance below 90 percent	34	40	33	34	39	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	9	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	37	56	71	20	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218
Course failure in Math	0	59	64	21	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	21	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	30	3	37	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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	37	52	62	23	13	28	52	62	23	0	0	0	0	352

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	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/14/2022

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	112	126	129	102	123	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	721
Attendance below 90 percent	24	43	34	32	35	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	2	1	10	5	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	27	24	40	11	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	29	23	38	12	27	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	11	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	30	29	38	18	25	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175

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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	112	126	129	102	123	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	721
Attendance below 90 percent	24	43	34	32	35	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	2	1	10	5	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	27	24	40	11	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	29	23	38	12	27	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	11	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	30	29	38	18	25	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	49%	46%	56%				46%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	47%						60%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						51%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	62%	50%	50%				55%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	59%						55%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%						31%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	53%	59%				53%	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	41%	44%	-3%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	45%	9%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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	50%	49%	1%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	45%	9%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	56%	44%	12%	53%	3%
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	22	32	23	29	36	19	33				
ELL	41	70		53							
BLK	31	31	19	40	52	30	28				
HSP	42	56		54	67		46				
MUL	71			64							
WHT	55	49	37	72	59	18	59				
FRL	42	48	34	51	59	31	43				
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	26	32	33	34	32	25				
ELL	53			50							
BLK	29	41	30	45	35	36	19				
HSP	48	50		55	65		45				
MUL	77			62							
WHT	51	65	50	73	60	29	59				
FRL	43	43	33	56	52	50	36				
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	18	51	46	26	36	14	22				
ELL	41	82		59	45						
BLK	29	59	60	41	57	41	15				
HSP	40	78		45	33		50				
MUL	50	64		59	71						
WHT	52	57	39	60	56	18	62				
FRL	35	52	50	41	49	34	30				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	54
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	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	68
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	
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	50
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	44
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?

Proficiency in ELA for third and fourth grade increased school-wide while proficiency in ELA in fifth grade decreased. Third grade proficiency in ELA went from 45% in 2021 to 47% in 2022. Fourth grade proficiency in ELA went from 47% in 2021 to 53% in 2022. Fifth grade proficiency in ELA went from 50% in 2021 to 46% in 2022. Proficiency in math for fourth and fifth grade students increased while math proficiency in third grade decreased. Fourth grade math proficiency went from 71% in 2021 to 73% in 2022. Fifth grade math proficiency went from 58% in 2021 to 65% in 2022. Third grade math proficiency decreased from 63% in 2021 to 52% in 2022. Fifth grade science proficiency increased from 47% in 2021 to 50% in 2022. Students with disabilities and students in the bottom quartile score significantly lower than their peers. Only 31% of students in the bottom quartile made learning gains in ELA and 28% in math.

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

School-wide data reflects the need for focused standards based instruction in each grade level in ELA. Third, fourth, and fifth grade ELA proficiencies are below the state average based on FSA testing. Third grade proficiency is 47% compared to the state average of 53%. Fourth grade proficiency is 53% compared to the state average of 57%. Fifth grade proficiency is 46% compared to the state proficiency of 55%.

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 are not reaching grade level proficiency because they are lacking mastery of prerequisite skills. Teachers will need to focus on accelerating learning by focusing on important prerequisite skills required to attain grade level mastery. Strategic planning will be important as teachers will need to focus on

planning instruction on current grade level standards while continuing to fill gaps in knowledge and skills that are not yet mastered. Strategic planning will take place twice a week during collaborative planning. Content Area Specialists and school administration will be in collaborative planning to support teachers as they build lessons to fill gaps and focus on grade level proficiency.

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

Overall school proficiency in math showed the most improvement. 63% of students in grades third through fifth are proficient in math compared to 56% which is the state's average.

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

A school-wide focus on Tier I instruction in ELA and math contributed to these proficiency improvements school-wide. Maplewood used collaborative planning to focus on Tier I instruction in all grade levels. Teachers designed tasks that were appropriately aligned to standards in each subject area and then used student data to determine the effectiveness of instruction. Additionally, Maplewood focused on small group instruction school-wide to ensure that students were receiving individual instruction on grade level standards while assessing the need for remediation. Small groups allow teachers to progress monitor students individually and prescribe a plan of action to accelerate learning.

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

Maplewood will use progress monitoring to determine student deficits in learning and provide individualized acceleration by addressing specific prerequisites missing for proficiency. Additionally, acceleration will take during small group instruction so that two-way communication can be ongoing between students and the teacher.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be ongoing on the effectiveness of small group instruction and the importance of continuing to expose students to grade level standards and instruction while filling gaps. Maplewood will use collaborative planning to support teachers in recognizing which prerequisites students need to be mastered to successfully respond to grade level instruction. Collaborative planning will occur twice a week. The first day will focus on rigorous tier I instruction. The second day will focus on tier II remediation and acceleration of learning for all students. During collaborative planning, needs will be assessed and professional development will be differentiated and provided as needed. Examples of professional development will include planning for effective small group instruction, using standards and test item specifications to plan for mastery, and training on effective center grouping and center activities.

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

Maplewood will use the high-yield instructional strategy of small group instruction to support learning. Based on Hattie's effect size of .47, small group instruction is effective in improving student outcomes for learning.

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 ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Progress monitoring of iReady data indicates that 80% of kindergarten students, 40% of first grade students, 48% of second grade students, and 63% of third grade students are on track to be considered proficient. Learning gains in ELA have dropped school-wide based on 2022 FSA data and iReady data. Implementing effective small group instruction in all classrooms will help teachers analyze student mastery on an individual level and allow teachers a better understanding of what prerequisite skills are needed to accelerate learning. If effective small group instruction is implemented school wide, then ELA proficiency should improve from 48%-51% as measured by the 2023 F.A.S.T.

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

Maplewood will increase proficiency in ELA in third, fourth, and fifth grade. Third grade proficiency in ELA will increase from 47%-50%, fourth grade proficiency will increase from 53%-56% and fifth grade proficiency will increase from 46%-49% as measured by the F.A.S.T.

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

Small group instruction in ELA will be monitored throughout the year by classroom walkthroughs to determine the rigor of instruction and guide professional development. Hattie's Index of teaching of direct instruction with an effect size of .59 will ensure that the teacher specifies learning outcomes, the teacher knows and communicates success criteria, builds commitment and engagement in learning, designs lessons with a check for understanding, guided practice, closure and independent practice in small group instruction. Student data will be analyzed weekly to determine interventions and next steps. Student progress monitoring meetings will be scheduled regularly to address individual student needs. The following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:

- Pre-K- 5th: F.A.S.T
- K-5: iReady AP2
- 3-5: DPMA (District Progress Monitoring Assessments)

Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Small group instruction focused on grade level standards will result in student achievement. This year, we will focus on student task alignment to the standard.

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

Small group instruction allows teachers to work one on one or in small groups with students that have similar needs. Instruction can be tailored to remediate students as needed while monitoring mastery of current standards. Hattie's effect size indicates that this strategy has a great impact on student 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.

Professional Development will be provided on effective small group instruction. Collaborative planning will focus on ELA direct instruction and planning for instructional tasks aligned with standards. Progress will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, and constructive feedback to ensure the reading block is being implemented appropriately with fidelity.

Person Responsible Beth Hipke (beth.hipke@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students with disabilities will participate in intensive small group instruction as well as an appropriate intervention that matches their deficiency and is delivered by a certified teacher. This subgroup will be monitored throughout the year to determine the effectiveness of the intervention and track progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

Student assessment data will be used to determine the effectiveness of professional development and small group instruction implementation.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Parent Engagement

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.
 Based on input from parent surveys, parents would like more information on assisting their students with academics at home. This is how Maplewood identified providing resources and academic trainings to parents as a critical need. According to the National Coalition for Parent Involvement, research indicates that regardless of student income or background, students with involved parents are more likely to have higher grades and test scores, attend school regularly, have better social skills, show improved behavior, and adapt well to school. Maplewood wants to create an environment that encourages learning, and communicates high yet reasonable expectations for each child's achievement.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
 Maplewood will involve parents in their child's education, and will give parents resources and strategies to help their students at home which will increase proficiency in both ELA and math by 3%. Proficiency will increase from 49%- 52% in ELA and 62 to 65% in math as measured by the 2023 F.A.S.T.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
 The effectiveness of parent trainings will be monitored through parent surveys and conversations with stakeholders. Student data will be monitored to track the academic progress of students and evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
 Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.
 Family engagement and involvement events will be planned to teach families ways to assist students with academics at home.

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

Parent Involvement is crucial for student success. Engaging families in academics and building a home-school relationship is key to student 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.

Based on parent survey feedback, family engagement and involvement activities will be planned based on family needs. These events will be offered both face to face and virtually and will be advertised through notes home, the school marquee, Skylert messages and newsletters.

Person Responsible Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

Maplewood will advertise the new SAC page on the school website where parents can email input and suggestions. This new link on the webpage will be advertised at the annual Title I meeting, through SKYLERT messages, and notes home.

Person Responsible James Martin (james.martin@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

Small group instruction focused on grade level standards will result in student achievement and proficiency in ELA. This year, we will focus on student task alignment to the standard. Based on the 2021-2022 end of year iReady data, 41 percent of first graders were proficient in ELA. This was the only grade level from kindergarten-second, that did not meet at least 50 percent proficiency. Small group instruction is an instructional practice that is proven to increase learning outcomes for students. During small group instruction, teachers can focus on accelerating learning and providing individualized scaffolding for students needing support. This practice was selected as a critical need school-wide because it allows true differentiation for all students in ELA.

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

Small group instruction focused on grade level standards will result in student achievement and proficiency in ELA. This year, we will focus on student task alignment to the standard. Based on the 2021-2022 FSA, 47 percent of third graders, and 46 percent of fifth graders were proficient in ELA. Small group instruction is an instructional practice that is proven to increase learning outcomes for students. During small group instruction, teachers can focus on accelerating learning and providing individualized scaffolding for students needing support. This practice was selected as a critical need school-wide because it allows true differentiation for all students in ELA.

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)

During the 2021-2022 school year, 86 percent of Kindergarten students, 41 percent of first graders, and 50 percent of second graders ended the year proficient in ELA as measured by iReady. Our goal for the 2022-2023 school year is to have at least 51% of students in kindergarten, first, and second grade be proficient in ELA as measured by the STAR early literacy and/or STAR early reading assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

During the 2021-2022 school year, 47 percent of third graders, 53 percent of fourth graders, and 46 percent of fifth graders ended the year proficient in ELA as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). For the 2022-2023 school year, at least 51% of students in third, fourth, and fifth grade will be proficient in ELA as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.).

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.

Small group instruction in ELA will be monitored throughout the year by classroom walkthroughs to determine the rigor of instruction and guide professional development. Hattie's Index of teaching of direct instruction with an effect size of .59 will ensure that the teacher specifies learning outcomes, the teacher knows and communicates success criteria, builds commitment and engagement in learning, designs lessons with a check for understanding, guided practice, closure and independent practice in small group instruction. Additionally, student data will be analyzed weekly to determine interventions and next steps. Student progress monitoring meetings will be scheduled regularly to address individual student needs. The following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:

Pre-K- 5th: F.A.S.T

K-5: iReady AP2

3-5: DPMA (District Progress Monitoring Assessments)

Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

DiSanza, Christine, christine.disanza@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?

Small group instruction focused on grade level standards will result in student achievement. This year, we will focus on student task alignment to the standard. Small group instruction meets Florida's definition of an

evidence-based practice as well as supports the Marion County K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan. Small group instruction allows for scaffolding which has an effect size of .82 on Hattie's Effect Sizes related to student achievement.

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?

Small group instruction allows teachers to work one on one or in small groups with students that have similar needs. Instruction can be tailored to remediate students as needed while monitoring mastery of current standards. Small group instruction supports the identified need of growth in ELA proficiency because research indicates scaffolding has an effect size of .82 on Hattie's Effect Sizes related to student achievement.

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 coaching will be provided throughout the year through scaffolded professional development on effective small group instruction. Collaborative planning will focus on ELA direct instruction and planning for instructional tasks aligned with standards. Progress will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, and constructive feedback to ensure the reading block is being implemented appropriately with fidelity. District and state assessments will be used to monitor student learning and adjust professional development needs.	Hipke, Beth, beth.hipke@marion.k12.fl.us
Student assessment data will be used to determine the effectiveness of professional development and small group instruction implementation.	DiSanza, Christine, christine.disanza@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.

Maplewood focuses on building a positive school culture for all staff, students, and stakeholders. Staff, student, and stakeholder input is solicited when making decisions. Students are celebrated for academic performance, good citizenship, setting and meeting individual goals, and doing their personal best. The school emphasizes the importance of the home-school relationship and ensures that families feel connected and have a say in their child's education. This is done through weekly call-outs by the principal, personal phone calls home from teachers and guidance counselors, newsletters, and face to face meetings. Administration partners with teachers each week and participates in planning. This is so teachers can ask questions, share concerns, offer ideas and add input to school planning.

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

Administration, teachers, and students are stakeholders who analyze school data and set goals for academic and behavior achievement. The PTO at Maplewood is effective at promoting both fun and educational activities the school has planned. The PTO does many things for students and teachers alike, such as planning special events, fundraisers, and festivals. The PTO also provides treats for students and staff throughout the year during holidays and special times such as Teacher Appreciation Week. This boosts morale throughout the school. The SAC also consists of school staff, community members, and families. The SAC gives input on the school improvement plan, budget, and also shares ideas on how to improve day to day functions at the school.