

Marion County Public Schools

Oakcrest 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oakcrest Elementary School

1112 NE 28TH ST, Ocala, FL 34470

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christine Sandy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: D (36%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oakcrest Elementary School

1112 NE 28TH ST, Ocala, FL 34470

[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	74%

School Grades History

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

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.

Oakcrest Elementary School inspires students to develop into global citizens, striving to make the world a better place.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Developing Global Citizens of Tomorrow.

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
Byard, James	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high-yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of the implementation of interventions and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specified areas.
Dyer, Holly	Other	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing and provides instructional support, including preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods, and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis and participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Mills, Meghan	Other	The Content Area Specialist (CAS) assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Best Standards and FSA Standards for math. The CAS provides instructional support, including the preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods, and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis and participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Nisbett, Kim	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor assists school administrators and educators with planning and carrying out school-related programs and events. Main duties include: helping students maintain academic focus, assisting students at risk, identifying individual skills, and tackling emotional problems. In addition, she interprets and conducts an analysis of data, facilitates the development of intervention plans, and provides support for intervention fidelity. She assists with professional development for behavior concerns and assists in facilitating data-based decision-making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the student's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Sandy, Christine	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Day-to-day management of school site ? School-home Liaison Facilitator ? Pre K - 5th-grade Instructional Leader ? Student Service Support Team Member ? Professional Development Facilitator ? School Safety Coordinator ? Human Resource Operations ? Student Achievement Monitor

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Christine Sandy

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.*

4

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

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

426

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

10

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

9

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	68	73	67	80	55	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	407
Attendance below 90 percent	36	35	28	31	20	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	4	13	9	12	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in ELA	10	25	24	28	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in Math	10	12	11	11	9	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	14	19	18	27	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	

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	9	0	0	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

Friday 7/29/2022

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	83	93	77	64	70	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	461	
Attendance below 90 percent	41	40	32	25	36	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207	
One or more suspensions	10	16	8	11	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	
Course failure in ELA	6	20	24	5	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	
Course failure in Math	0	25	23	4	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	

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	6	28	25	10	27	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	

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	83	93	77	64	70	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	461
Attendance below 90 percent	41	40	32	25	36	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207
One or more suspensions	10	16	8	11	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in ELA	6	20	24	5	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in Math	0	25	23	4	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	6	28	25	10	27	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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	

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	40%	46%	56%				27%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						52%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						71%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	50%	50%				22%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%						33%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						28%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	53%	59%				23%	47%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	24%	44%	-20%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	28%	49%	-21%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2022					
	2019	28%	45%	-17%	56%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

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	23%	49%	-26%	62%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	26%	54%	-28%	64%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
05	2022					
	2019	20%	45%	-25%	60%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	23%	44%	-21%	53%	-30%

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

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	13	29		25	33						
ELL	14			57	90						
BLK	30	41	38	46	56	47	30				
HSP	31	48		52	62		57				
MUL	58			58							
WHT	63	52		70	56		73				
FRL	35	46	41	52	57	48	40				
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	12	23		24	46		7				
ELL	38			23							
BLK	21	33	35	27	41	57	13				
HSP	31			34							
MUL	50			67							
WHT	67	75		56	50		36				
FRL	31	43	41	36	48	60	19				
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	6	55		3	15	20					
ELL	26	47		16	33		20				
BLK	21	48	71	15	30	33	13				
HSP	30	58		21	29		13				
MUL	50			58							
WHT	35	54		32	38		38				
FRL	24	50	71	19	27	24	17				

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	48

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	41
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	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	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
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?

Based on current FSA ELA data, overall ELA proficiency continues to trend upward. As the 2019 overall proficiency was at 27%, 2021 had reached 35%, and currently, in 2022, it is at 40%. The same trend is noted in our Learning Gains. In 2019 Learning Gains were at 52%, then dipped to 43% in 2021, and now have climbed back to 48%. The increase in Learning Gains data supported our proficiency increase as the students scoring at Level 2 last year improved to Level 3. This same trend was noted in our bottom quartile.

Based on current FSA math data, overall math proficiency continues to trend upward. As the 2019 overall proficiency was at 22%, 2021 had reached 38%, and currently, in 2022, it is at 54%. The same trend is noted in our Learning Gains. In 2019 Learning Gains were at 33%, increased to 48% in 2021, and remained the same at 48% in 2022. The Learning Gains data supported our proficiency increase as the students scoring at Level 2 last year improved to Level 3. The dip in our bottom quartile from 60% to 46% indicates the level of math deficiency in our Level 1 students.

Based on the Statewide Science Assessment data, 5th-grade proficiency is trending upward. Starting at

23% in 2019, to 21% in 2021, and currently, at 48%, the overall data indicates an improvement in student proficiency.

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

Overall, ELA data has been identified as building reading proficiency in grades 3-5 as a need for improvement. With a 40% proficiency in our school grade, 4 out of 10 students are reading at grade level or above. Specifically, 3rd grade at 35% proficiency and 5th grade at 34% are identified as the most at risk. 4th grade is stronger at 41%. Analyzing iReady AP3 results for 3rd grade has identified phonics and vocabulary as the great deficit, whereas in 4th and 5th, the need is to improve vocabulary and comprehension strategies.

As half the math students in grades 3-5 are identified as proficient (54%), the need for improvement is not as great. With the 16% improvement from the previous year, the strategies put in place last year appeared to have had an impact on proficiency. However, when analyzing iReady AP3 results, students still struggle with their understanding of basic mathematical operations. In 3rd grade, it is mastery of multiplication facts. In 4th grade, it is division, and 5th graders are still struggling with fractions and decimals.

Science data has identified the greatest need for improvement is vocabulary. It appears students are able to master content, but independently reading the text remains a challenge. There appeared to be a trend in our results of proficient readers being proficient in science and those struggling in reading, struggled on the science assessment.

Overarching these results is our attendance rate. Though improved from the previous year, it is still of concern.

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

Even though 3-5th grade proficiency is trending upward, 4% of 3rd graders scored a Level 1 on the 2022 FSA. This percentage also aligns with iReady AP3 results. This grade level currently has the greatest number of at-risk readers.

i-Ready analysis has specifically identified phonics, vocabulary, and fluency are of primary concern. Also contributing are the risk factors of attendance and ELA course failure. 31 students of the 81 enrolled have attendance below 90%, and 28 of 81 have identified course failure.

The Home School Liaison will continue to address Tier 1 attendance issues, while Tier 2 and Tier 3 concerns will be referred to the Social Worker. Parent engagement to improve attendance is essential.

It is imperative ELA grades be tracked beginning with Q1 interims. Students demonstrating course failure need immediate intervention. Mentoring support needs to be provided to identify barriers to student's mastery of course content.

MTSS interventions need alignment to identify student deficiencies with strategic progress monitoring. As the district has adapted new interventions, their alignment to student needs requires continued analysis and fluid placement.

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

The greatest proficiency in FSA growth occurred in science. From 21% proficiency in 2021 to 48% in 2022, the percentage of improvement was 27 points. Secondly was math proficiency. From 38% proficiency to 54%, the overall growth was 16 points. ELA proficiency demonstrated only a 5% improvement. We were able to grow from 35% to 40%, but it still was the weakest of the three subjects.

Specifically, 5th grade FSA results demonstrated the greatest positive increase in proficiency in 2022. Science improved by 27%, ELA by 3%, and math by 20%. Overall, 5th-grade math proficiency has reached 50%. From 20 % in 2019 to 50% in 2022, 5th grade has made significant improvement.

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

The school provided a laser focus on individual student needs with a 1:1 focus on mentoring, monitoring, and re-teaching.

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

Continue to provide content area specialists to support ELA, math, and science Tier I collaborative practices.

Continue to provide additional paras to support mastery of ELA, math, and science Tier 1 instruction.

Continue to provide paras to provide ELA and math Tier 2 remediation.

Continue to provide ELA MTSS interventions to students identified as non-proficient.

Implement an enrichment ELA program for proficient readers.

Implement newly identified researched based MTSS interventions.

Implement a K-2 Tier 1 core phonics program.

Implement student engagement strategies to improve attendance and mastery of standards.

Continue to provide instructional tools aligned to BEST standards supporting Tier I.

Continue to provide the Science of Reading, effective math practices, and the Nature of Science professional development content for faculty and staff, along with effective teaching and progress monitoring techniques.

Support Family Engagement best practices.

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.

Our coaches, with the support of the transformation office, continue to receive support and guidance on the design and implementation of highly effective collaborative sessions. In addition, coaches provide professional learning during grade level collaborative sessions, identifying learning targets for the BEST standards, analyzing mastery checks, and planning instruction to meet the standard's content limits.

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

K-5 students are scheduled for a daily MTSS intervention based on identified needs. The 50-minute MTSS block is built into the master schedule with every faculty and staff member providing services. The district continues to provide researched based reading interventions, and professional development for each intervention is available.

The support staff is continually assigned to classroom/students identified most at risk based on progress monitoring data. Data drives every response, and plans for improvement are aligned to the need.

A continual shift toward student ownership and setting high expectations for content mastery is in place. The expected result will be students' engagement in learning by having them own their data, create their

own goals, and feel success through scaffolding of support.

Collaboration services providing a focus on knowledge, tools, and resources to assist teachers in becoming highly effective in their craft of teaching students within each classroom are included in the master schedule. Content area specialists, along with the assistant principal, oversee these collaboration services. Additionally, building a sense of community through collaboration will continue to sustain teacher ownership of our vision and mission and decrease teacher turnover.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

If we focus on strategies to increase student self-accountability and advance individual responsibility of self, then the number of K-5 identified as SWD will demonstrate an increase in reading and math proficiency. The data indicates an index of 25%, 16% below the expected rate of 41%. This is the third year Students with Disabilities have fallen below expectations.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

If we provide teachers with professional learning and collaborative planning in the Science of Reading and effective math strategies, then the percentage of proficient economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 will increase from an average of 25% to 42%.

Progress monitoring will be conducted in August, January, and May. The August and January results will drive targeted monitoring plans for students not meeting the proficiency levels.

Monitoring:

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

Students have currently been placed into an iReady instructional path based on last year's AP3 results. This instructional path will be amended based on student progress. iReady progress monitoring (AP 2) will be conducted in January. The instructional path will be amended based on student progress.

Periodic district benchmark ELA/math assessments supported by the district and both SAVVAS core series will be assigned to students throughout the year to monitor content mastery and determine needed remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Byard (james.byard@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

SAVVAS Core Reading and SAVVAS core math will provide Tier I instruction. Support facilitators will address the mastery of the content by implementing Tier 2/3 strategies, track progress and remediate as needed following weekly collaboration sessions.

Ongoing progress monitoring will occur utilizing STAR and/or BEST state assessments three times a year for comparative data. iReady AP2 is a researched based progress monitoring tool that will also assess mastery proficiency. District/school-based formative assessments will monitor mastery of benchmarks. Internal program formative checks of district-approved intervention programs will periodically monitor MTSS progress.

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

Formative assessments (.90 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) use formative assessments to improve student outcomes and refer to teachers attending to what is happening for each student in their classroom as a result of their instruction.

**resources/criteria
used for selecting
this strategy.**

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.

Provide reading and math core Tier I in an inclusion environment with the support of a Support Facilitator.

Person Responsible Christine Sandy (christine.sandy@marion.k12.fl.us)

Support Facilitators will participate in weekly collaborative ELA/math sessions to build capacity of BEST standards, formative assessments, and instructional strategies to support Tier 2/3 interventions.

Person Responsible James Byard (james.byard@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor formative data to adjust instruction/ interventions as needed.

Person Responsible Holly Dyer (holly.dyer@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

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

According to the 2022 school year attendance reports, 165 students in grades K-5 logged attendance below 90%, and 108 students showed two or more Early Warning Systems indicators. This data demonstrates a need to advance self-accountability to improve attendance and focus on learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we focus on strategies to increase student self-accountability and advance individual responsibility of self, then the number of K-5 students reporting attendance below 90% will decrease from 165 to 155, and the students with two or more Early Warning Systems indicators will decrease from 108 to 98 at the end of the 23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Focus on student self-accountability to begin the shift of student ownership and high expectations of attendance and grade reporting. The expected result will be increased students' engagement in school attendance and academic performance by having them own their data, create their own goals and feel success through scaffolding of support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Byard (james.byard@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

High Expectations for Students (1.44 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) refers to students' expectations for and beliefs in themselves. Involves students predicting or self-reporting grades. Make learning intentions and success criteria transparent, have high but appropriate expectations, and provide feedback at the appropriate levels to build confidence in taking on challenging tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

As students are in attendance, they are more able to self-regulate their learning and master the content being presented. Consequently, when grading indicates mastery of benchmarks, one must be in attendance to evaluate this progress and determine the appropriate intervention. When not in attendance, learning in the classroom continues, and mastery of the content by the student is questioned.

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.

Home-School Liaison will monitor Tier I attendance concerns and refer those students of further concern to the social worker for Tier 2/3 support. The Home-School Liaison will implement an attendance incentive system for students and work closely with families to remove attendance barriers.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Nisbett (kimberly.nisbett@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students will track mastery of benchmarks by goal setting and recording their progress. Families will partner with the process through engagement activities, including student-led Open House, family conferences, and periodic data chats to increase student accountability for success.

Person Responsible Meghan Mills (meghan.mills@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

A newly adopted K-2 Tier I phonemic awareness and phonics program called UFLI is being adopted for each classroom. This scripted, 30 minute program is aligned to a specific grade level scope and sequence and provides initial instruction, formative assessment, and remedial support.

The content area specialist will provide ongoing professional development on phonemic awareness and phonics knowledge, program implementation, and data analysis of student mastery.

Classroom teachers will receive at least 12 hours of professional development in the phonemic awareness and phonics subject area, understanding formative assessments and how to monitor student mastery.

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

MTSS practices are being redesigned. Non-proficient readers will be placed in newly provided interventions. Proficient readers are being scheduled into an enrichment block focusing on the application of reading in content-specific subjects.

The content area specialist will provide ongoing professional development on the implementation of specific interventions, formative assessment activities, and data analysis of student mastery.

MTSS providers will complete at least five hours of professional development in content, monitoring, and data analysis.

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)

A newly adopted Tier I core phonics program for grades K-2 is being adopted. Therefore, at each grade level, using the STAR progress monitoring system, 50% of the students will be on track to meet ELA proficiency targets.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In each 3-5th grade, using the FAST progressing monitoring system, 50% of all students will meet ELA proficiency targets.

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.

Progress monitoring will be conducted in August, January, and May. The August and January results will drive targeted monitoring plans for students not meeting the proficiency levels.

Students have currently been placed into an iReady instructional path based on last year's AP3 results. This instructional path will be amended for a student as needed. iReady progress monitoring (AP 2) will be conducted in January. The instructional path will be amended based on student progress.

Periodic district benchmark ELA assessments supported by the district and SAVVAS core series will be assigned to students throughout the year to monitor content mastery and determine needed remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sandy, Christine, christine.sandy@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

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

The following programs have been vetted to the BEST Standards, included in the district's K-12 Reading Plan, and are approved for implementation as either a Tier 1 or remedial support at Tier 2/3:

- *UFLI phonic instruction for K-2
- *SAVVAS Core Reading
- *Haggerty for phonemic awareness
- *SIPPS for phonics
- *Read 180 for comprehension
- *Lexia Core for comprehension
- *Read Naturally for fluency

Ongoing progress monitoring will occur utilizing STAR and/or BEST state assessments three times a year for comparative data. iReady AP2 is a researched based progress monitoring tool that will also assess the mastery of phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension toward reading proficiency. District/school-based formative assessments will monitor mastery of benchmarks. Internal program formative checks of district-approved intervention programs will periodically monitor MTSS progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

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

The district has vetted all school-based ELA programs, provided professional development, and provided the framework of ongoing progress monitoring. Their selection was based on the determination made by investigating available reading research and its match to needs of the reader.

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
Build faculty and capacity in their understanding of highly effective Science of Reading and student engagement strategies through weekly collaborative practices. By agreeing to operational norms, outcome deliverables, and established learning expectations, collaborative practices will focus on Tier I student-centered coaching and differentiation of Tier 2/3 support.	Dyer, Holly, holly.dyer@marion.k12.fl.us
Provide ongoing professional learning opportunities focused on effective initial phonics instruction and remedial support for identified faculty and staff working directly with students.	Dyer, Holly, holly.dyer@marion.k12.fl.us
Analyze progress monitor data to determine student progress and determine if an intervention continues to be appropriate for identified student needs.	Byard, James, james.byard@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 continuously consult with teachers, students, families, volunteers, and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand 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, and information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;

- Explanation of the school's Parent and Family Engagement Plan and school-parent compact;
- Explanation of the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
- Explanation of how parents have the right to request meetings, formulate suggestions and participate in decisions about the education of their children.
- Allow for feedback and open discussion of successes and possible concerns.

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

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment, we offer communication in a variety of online and paper formats with our families. These resources include phone, email, Dojo, text, school website, teacher webpage, CANVAS classroom, Facebook, Skyward Parent Portal, and school marquee and QR code links.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys, and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys. Parents and the community are kept current on the school focus through paper and digital formats.

This upcoming year will continue a business partnership with a focus on increasing on-campus participation with stakeholders. It is our goal to reinforce the value of the educational experience, build a culture of collaboration and provide learning opportunities that we can not provide the students.