

Marion County Public Schools

Marion Oaks 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

Marion Oaks Elementary School

280 MARION OAKS TRL, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Dreher

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

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 (45%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (37%)
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

Marion Oaks Elementary School

280 MARION OAKS TRL, Ocala, FL 34473

[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	70%

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.

Marion Oaks Elementary School seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for all students, through developmentally appropriate and ambitious instruction, that allows for individual differences and learning styles. Each student's success is based upon the school, home and community connection to ensure that each child will become a life-long learner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Marion Oaks Elementary School all stakeholders work together to create students who are lifelong learners that feel safe and inspired.

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
Dreher, Lisa	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school. She works with stakeholders to develop a common vision and mission for the school. She guides and works with the leadership team to analyze student data in order to monitor student progress to drive instruction and provide curriculum resources aligned to the Florida standards; develops a program that promotes professional development based on evaluations and feedback in order to retain an effective/highly effective staff; and build relationships with parents and the community.
Almaguer, Hazel	School Counselor	The school counselor provides support for social emotional learning; provides experiences for students to explore career development; helps students to problem solve and cope effectively to be become productive citizens within our community. The school counselor also supports students by monitoring attendance concerns.
Griffin, Jennifer	School Counselor	The school counselor provides support for social emotional learning; provides experiences for students to explore career development; helps students to problem solve and cope effectively to be become productive citizens within our community. The school counselor also supports students by monitoring attendance concerns.
Soto, Nancy	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through her expertise in curriculum and analyzing student data to drive decision making for instruction. The assistant principal also supports the teachers by using evaluations and observations to determine staff needs in professional development and instructional support through mentoring, modeling, and coaching.
Deubel, Christine	Math Coach	The content area specialist for mathematics provides expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff; uses leading/lagging student data and/or staff surveys to provide professional development opportunities; and/or supports students by modeling instructional strategies.
Maldonado, Dawn	Reading Coach	The content area specialist for ELA provides expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff; uses leading/lagging student data and/or staff surveys to provide professional development opportunities; and/or supports students by modeling instructional strategies.
McNulty, Jason	Dean	The student service manager works with the principal primarily to develop guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies as well as procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning. He maintains visibility and accessibility on the school campus and at school-related activities and events during work day. He also works together with the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		school counselor to support students with problem solving and coping effectively to be become productive citizens within our community.
Ashberger, Kelly	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through her expertise in curriculum and analyzing student data to drive decision making for instruction. The assistant principal also supports the teachers by using evaluations and observations to determine staff needs in professional development and instructional support through mentoring, modeling, and coaching.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/22/2019, Lisa Dreher

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.*

3

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

Total number of students enrolled at the school

858

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

18

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

20

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	138	127	147	149	156	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	886
Attendance below 90 percent	62	41	52	48	40	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	296
One or more suspensions	10	4	7	7	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	25	35	75	36	10	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	215
Course failure in Math	24	20	55	18	14	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	51	51	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	58	48	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	4	7	15	48	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

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	27	31	61	26	14	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205

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	1	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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 7/11/2022

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	117	147	151	149	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	815
Attendance below 90 percent	41	48	52	53	66	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
One or more suspensions	4	4	4	6	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	7	26	56	24	26	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176
Course failure in Math	11	19	33	28	29	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	7	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	9	26	44	26	33	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192

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	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	117	147	151	149	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	815
Attendance below 90 percent	41	48	52	53	66	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
One or more suspensions	4	4	4	6	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	7	26	56	24	26	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176
Course failure in Math	11	19	33	28	29	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	7	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	9	26	44	26	33	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192

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	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	46%	56%				38%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						51%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						46%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	44%	50%	50%				53%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	52%						59%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						49%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	53%	59%				36%	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	42%	44%	-2%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	35%	45%	-10%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

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	66%	49%	17%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	37%	45%	-8%	60%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	32%	44%	-12%	53%	-21%
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	45	43	17	40	39	15				
ELL	18	36	44	29	38	29	9				
BLK	39	63	46	39	50	36	30				
HSP	35	49	45	38	46	33	24				
MUL	30	45		35	45						
WHT	55	66	40	54	60	75	45				
FRL	38	54	44	39	51	45	27				

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	22	24	26	21	16	21	18				
ELL	29	35	18	33	26	15	34				
BLK	35	58		33	16		35				
HSP	36	42	20	39	30	19	32				
MUL	24			24							
WHT	46	46		44	39		40				
FRL	35	43	35	36	32	20	33				
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	16	39	37	30	55	50	15				
ELL	34	46	39	49	60	58	22				
BLK	26	50	38	45	58	38	27				
HSP	38	45	42	52	58	54	31				
MUL	47	75		40	33						
WHT	42	56	52	58	64	55	43				
FRL	38	51	44	51	57	45	34				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	43
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
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 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	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

FSA Achievement levels over three years averaged 40% for ELA and 43% for Math placing students 15% /14% below the state average in both core content areas. All areas in ELA and Math demonstrated increases in each category from 2021 to 2022.

School Grade Component Data 2019 2021 2022

ELA Achievement 38% 39% 42% Three Year Average 40%
 ELA Learning Gains 51% 45% 56% Three Year Average 50%
 ELA Lowest 25th Percentile 46% 40% 44% Three Year Average 43%

Math Achievement 53% 40% 44% Three Year Average 46%
 Math Learning Gains 59% 30% 52% Three Year Average 47%
 Math Lowest 25th Percentile 49% 23% 44% Three Year Average 39%

Science Achievement 36% 36% 32% Three Year Average 35%

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

Reading continues to be the area of greatest concern, since it impacts all other academic areas. Reading scores for third and fourth grade reading increased; however, fifth grade scores decreased by two percentage points from 2021 to 2022.

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 continues to be an area that needs improvement across grade levels. During collaboration content area specialists and administration will work closely with teachers to design standard based activities that will be used to enhance tier 1 instruction. Data will be used to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners in all content areas. Professional development will be offered to improve tier 1 instruction.

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

The areas that showed the most improvement was an increase in fourth grade ELA and third grade math. Fourth grade proficiency increased by nine points from 36% to 45% while third grade math increased by seventeen points from 30% to 47%.

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

During third and fourth grade collaboration teachers focused on creating rigorous standard based activities for both whole and small group instruction. Teachers used results from standard based assessments to determine small groups, plan and implement learning activities that met the depth of the standard.

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

Differentiated small group instruction will take place in all grade levels. In grades K-2 students will receive explicit and systematic phonics instruction that will introduce students to the foundational reading skills necessary for proficient reading. Teachers will be trained using the University of Florida Literacy Institute's foundation program. During collaboration teachers will plan rigorous learning activities that promote student engagement in daily literacy and math tasks that use complex texts, operations and higher order questions. After school tutoring will be offered; the program will focus on increasing student reading and math proficiency.

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 offered during collaborative planning to provide teachers with ideas and strategies to improve small group instruction. Training will be offered to K-5 teachers on new B.E.S.T ELA and math standards; K-2 teachers will be trained on the implementation of systematic phonics instruction. Content area specialist will provide teachers with professional development that will be used to accelerate learning in math through student practice and the alignment of activities to the depth and rigor of grade level standards.

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

Marion Oaks Elementary School will continue to focus on improving Tier 1 instruction. Collaborative planning will occur two times per week in which teachers will use student data to drive instruction that will impact student achievement and proficiency in all core subjects. The administrative team will conduct regular walkthroughs to collect and monitor instructional data. Data will be used for targeted discussions with teachers to improve instructional practices. By focusing on systematic phonics instruction in primary grades then student reading proficiency will increase in the years to come.

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.**

Upon the review of data for the past three years, that include state assessment data, district assessment data and classroom assessment data it is evident that Marion Oaks Elementary School needs to focus on planning, aligning and delivering rigorous Tier 1 instruction for all content areas specifically ELA.

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

Marion Oaks Elementary School will focus on planning, aligning, and delivering rigorous Tier 1 instruction thus learning gains and proficiency in ELA, Math and Science will increase by 7% as measured by the 2022 F.A.S.T. Students in kindergarten through second grade will increase reading and math scores by 7% as measured by iReady.

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

Weekly classroom walkthroughs will be conducted and data collected, district and state assessment data (such as i-Ready diagnostic and progress monitoring, F.A.S.T.) will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will utilize well-planned checks for understandings and other formative data to plan and provide small group instruction. Instructional coaches will provide targeted support during collaboration on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment and check for understanding. The administrative team will facilitate regularly scheduled data chats with teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

Professional development on student achievement (.51 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies). Marion Oaks Elementary School will offer professional development that will focus on increasing student differentiation through small group instruction. Teachers will also receive professional development on disseminating data to drive and plan for small group instruction. Through collaboration and professional development opportunities teachers will learn how to implement strategies that will provide rigorous Tier 1 instruction, differentiation, and small group instruction. Teachers will plan higher order questions and check for understandings during collaboration two times per week for all content areas.

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

Research shows that if teachers receive sufficient and ongoing professional development to deliver rigorous Tier 1 core instruction then students receiving the instruction will show outcomes that indicates a greater level of proficiency.

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 to all instructional and classroom paraprofessionals on reading strategies and small group implementation which will have a direct impact on all content areas. Collaborative planning will take place two times per week in order to plan for tier 1 instruction, differentiation, and small group instruction.

Person Responsible Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

Based on state assessment data Students with Disabilities and ELL students need additional support in order to increase student proficiency. In order to increase proficiency Marion Oaks Elementary School will focus on increasing student engagement and goal setting in order to increase student proficiency in these subgroups.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

Marion Oaks Elementary School will increase student engagement and learning gains therefore proficiency in ELA, Math and Science will increase by 7% as measured by 2022 F.A.S.T..

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and students will meet regularly to track and measure goals. This will increase student engagement as students take ownership for their progress. During weekly collaboration teachers will identify trends in student data. Administration will monitor student goals and objectives through weekly collaborative discussions with teachers. During classroom walkthroughs administration will engage in student dialogue based on student data folders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

In addition to goal setting and student data trackers, teachers will work collaboratively each week to plan activities that will increase student engagement for all students in all core subjects.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

According to John Hattie "Visible Learning" students' expectations for and beliefs in themselves has a 1.44 effect size. "Making the learning intentions and success criteria transparent, having high, but appropriate, expectations, and providing feedback at the appropriate levels is critical to building confidence in taking on challenging tasks."

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.

In addition to providing teachers with opportunities to collaborate and to plan highly engaging activities for students, Marion Oaks Elementary school's Home School Liaison and Content Area Specialists will also

work with parents in order to provide parent trainings and events that will increase student engagement at home and at school.

Person Responsible Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to i-Ready diagnostic data used to screen K-2 students in the spring of 2022, students measuring early, mid, or above on grade level are as follows: • Kindergarten 66% • First Grade 44% • Second Grade 39%; therefore the following scored below grade level Kindergarten 34% •First Grade 56% •Second Grade 61% as measured by i-Ready.

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

According to FSA data 47% of third graders, 41% of fourth graders, and 42% of 5th graders were proficient; however 53% of third graders, 59% of fourth graders and 58% of fifth graders were not proficient as measured by FSA.

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)

According to 2021 i-Ready diagnostic data used to screen K-2 students in the spring of 2021 students measuring early, mid, or above on grade level are as follows: • Kindergarten 82% • First Grade 44% • Second Grade 56%; therefore the following scored below grade level Kindergarten 18% •First Grade 56% •Second Grade 44% as measured by i-Ready.

If students in K-2 receive explicit, systematic foundational reading skills instruction, then we will increase the number of students measuring early, mid, or above grade level by 10%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

According to 2021 FSA data 37% of third graders, 36% of fourth graders, and 40% of 5th graders were proficient; however, 63% of third graders, 64% of fourth graders and 60% of fifth graders were not proficient as measured by FSA.

If students in grades 3-5 receive standards-aligned instruction using grade-level text and instructional acceleration strategies, then the number of students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment will increase by 10%.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

State Progress Monitoring Assessments and District Benchmark Assessments will be used to monitor progress toward the desired outcome. Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. In addition, administrators will monitor the fidelity of implementation of the Foundational Skills instruction in grades K-2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dreher, Lisa, lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Students in grades K-2 will use the UFLI Foundation Curriculum to support foundational reading instruction at the Tier I level. This program is aligned with the science of reading and is supported by Just Read Florida. The instructional materials are aligned with the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. Students in grades 3-5 will use district-created lesson plans to align the adopted instructional resources to the new B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. In collaborative planning, teachers will embed high impact teaching strategies into the ELA lesson plans. Both the curriculum and teaching strategies align with the MCPS Achieve 2026 Strategic Plan

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

K-2: The research based UFLI Foundation Reading Curriculum incorporates direct instruction, multiple exposures and daily feedback in the instructional routine. Direct instruction has an effect size of 0.59, Multiple Exposures has an effect size of 0.71, and Feedback has an effect size of 0.73 (Hattie 2009). 3-5: High Impact Teaching Strategies engaging students in dialogue to extend their thinking, to provide multiple ways of responding, and to provide formative feedback work together to increase learning. Questioning has an effect size of 0.46 and Feedback has an effect size of 0.73 (Hattie 2009).

Action Steps to Implement:

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching: The literacy content specialist and administrative team will implement a coaching cycle to support reading instruction based on observational classroom data and results of progress monitoring from state, district, and classroom data.	Maldonado, Dawn, dawn.maldonado@marion.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning: Professional development will be offered on implementing standard based learning activities as well as explicit, systematic foundational skills instruction in grades K-2.	Dreher, Lisa, lisa.dreher@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 consult with our teachers, students, families, and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress
- Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact
- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different options (online and paper based) of communication for our families such as scheduled meetings, phone calls, emails, ClassDojo/Remind App posts/messaging, Twitter posts, virtual meetings via Zoom/Microsoft Teams, the school's website, teacher web-pages Skyward Family Access and our school marquee.

Family and community feedback are requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and school wide Improvement Plan surveys.

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

We have many stakeholders who contribute and make an impact to promote a positive school culture and environment at Marion Oaks Elementary School.

- Students impact the culture and environment by being engaged in learning.
- Parents make an impact with their partnership with the school to ensure successful student learning.
- Teachers provide the delivery of instruction through the development of engaging and relevant lesson plans and activities/assignments.
- The administrators ensure that the school environment is conducive to learning and are instructional leaders.
Instructional leadership is based on data driven decision to support the building capacity of the instructional staff and resources.
- The business partner supports the school through career awareness and by providing funding are supplemental resources.
- The community provides volunteer hours and donations of funds and/or supplemental resources.