Reddick Collier Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Reddick Collier Elementary School

4595 W HIGHWAY 316, Reddick, FL 32686

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Donald Manning

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: F (28%)
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

Reddick Collier Elementary School

4595 W HIGHWAY 316, Reddick, FL 32686

[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	66%

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.

Reddick-Collier celebrates the people we are, the work we do, and the difference we make.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reddick-Collier is building a strong foundation for graduation and beyond.

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
Cooper, Melicia	Principal	Instructional Leader of the school. Oversees all content areas. Attends leadership metings. Conducts data chats with instructional staff to determine professional development needs. Provides resources: time, money and personnel for meetings and interventions. Collaborates/Consults with teachers. Monitirs implementationof Core, Supplemental and Intensive supports to determine they are research based and implementedwith fidelity. Monitor data as it relates to safety, discipline and school climate. Share this data with all stakeholders and provide opportunity for all stakeholders to provide input for change and problem solving as necessary.
Newmones, Stacie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assist 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 the intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additonal academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specified areas.
Krietemeyer, Carol	Reading Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpetation and implementation of the Florida Standards & B.E.S.T Standards for Language Arts and Writing. Provides instsructional support to include 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 participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Sage, Michelle	Math Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for math and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods, and instructioanl modleing. She also assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Jackson, Sandra	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor oversees the areas of youth mental health, as well as 504 and ESE staffings. Duties and responsibilities include counseling students, attendance, social work, DCF liaison, mentoring, needy student programs, character education, and homeless students needs.
Wager, Jenny	Dean	The Dean oversees the areas of discipline and behavior, supports teachers with classroom management needs, and oversees the following: fire and ALICE drills, school safety, Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS), behavior MTSS, and PST meetings for behavior.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Donald Manning

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

355

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

7

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

6

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	53	44	62	67	41	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	332
Attendance below 90 percent	23	15	19	22	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	15	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	15	20	20	23	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Course failure in Math	8	13	18	7	2	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	26	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	12	16	16	22	2	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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

Tuesday 8/2/2022

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	48	69	59	50	74	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	358
Attendance below 90 percent	21	21	20	19	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	7	6	7	6	22	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA	14	28	25	8	18	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
Course failure in Math	14	20	27	11	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	6	5	1	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	20	23	27	12	29	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	48	69	59	50	74	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	358
Attendance below 90 percent	21	21	20	19	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	7	6	7	6	22	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA	14	28	25	8	18	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
Course failure in Math	14	20	27	11	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	6	5	1	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	20	23	27	12	29	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	35%	47%	56%				40%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	61%				55%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	51%	52%				44%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	38%	54%	60%				46%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%	62%	64%				57%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	55%				61%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	42%	51%				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	45%	44%	1%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	30%	49%	-19%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	45%	1%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

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	64%	49%	15%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	45%	-11%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	37%	44%	-7%	53%	-16%
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	4	32		18	58		8				
ELL	60	75		40	92						
BLK	24	48	43	27	76	74	21				
HSP	53	65		47	80		43				
WHT	44	78		56	63		60				
FRL	36	55	43	37	67	74	35				

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	9	46		15	38	20					
ELL	39			30							
BLK	25	56	70	21	30	25	20				
HSP	37	50		45	64		55				
WHT	67	53		59	59		73				
FRL	34	49	75	33	43	25	44				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	9	38	38	10	62	62					
ELL	42	73		48	71						
BLK	31	56	42	41	58	57	17				
HSP	39	59		50	59		36				
WHT	52	56		49	53		55				
FRL	35	54	46	44	56	63	31				

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	53
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	67
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	45
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	60
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	60
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	53
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?

Student performance using grade-level progress monitoring tools consistently demonstrated student performance below 40% proficiency across all grade levels for both ELA and Math. FSA achievement levels over 3 years averaged 38% for ELA and 40% for Math, placing our students at least 20% below state averages in both core content areas.

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

An analysis of the provided data demonstrates deficits in proficiency for 3-5 graders in both ELA and Math. This creates an urgency to correct these deficits since they are 2023 state assessment grade levels.

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

New actions to address ELA and Math proficiency will include small group targeted instruction in the classroom during the ELA and Math blocks to improve overall achievement. Many students demonstrate gaps in content-specific vocabulary acquisition. Both explicit and implicit vocabulary instruction would improve ELA and Math achievement.

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

Fourth grade demonstrated a 26% increase in Math achievement. Fourth grade had a 7% increase in ELA achievement from Spring 2021 to Spring 2022.

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

During the double MTSS, ELA, and Math blocks students transitioned to assigned teachers to receive small group interventions based on performance data. During collaborative planning, teachers worked together standards-based instruction to support the needs of all students.

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

School-wide vocabulary instruction will be implemented as a systematic approach to word awareness and understanding of word roots to increase ELA proficiency. Tier 1 math lessons will be structured to allow students to learn and develop strategies to solve problems to increase 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 as teachers develop skillsets with strategies to teach new vocabulary both directly and indirectly with frequent opportunities for students to learn new words in oral and print content. Additionally, professional development will be offered during collaborative planning to accelerate learning in math.

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

We will continue to focus on Tier 1 instruction looking at data to drive instruction. Collaboration meetings will be focused and targeted for the greatest impact for our teachers in reading and in math. The administrative team will complete weekly walkthroughs looking for trends to continue to monitor improvement. Walkthrough forms will be kept in Google forms where leadership can assess trends by grade levels and see how teachers are progressing in their instructional practice. Targeted feedback is provided to teachers looking for high yield instructional strategies.

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.	ELA Proficiency has trended 40% and below since 2017. Only 35% of 3-5th grade students scored 3 or higher on the FSA in 2022. 4th grade students demonstrated higher learning achievement with 41% earning a 3 or higher.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	If we provide all instructional staff Tier 1 reading instruction with an emphasis on small group instruction targeting fluency, phonics, and vocabulary, then our overall ELA proficiency will increase by 5%. When students cannot read on grade level it affects their ability to learn in all subjects.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Weekly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data (such as iReady diagnostic, iReady progress monitoring, F.A.S.T, MTSS data, etc.) will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. 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 assessments results. As well as utilizing informative assessment data to provide targeted small group instruction with administration monitoring weekly. The CAS will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and check for understanding.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melicia Cooper (melicia.cooper@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students will participate in 10 minutes per day of explicit, vocabulary-based instruction in grades K-5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the	According to Hattie's index of Teaching & Learning Strategies, "Students who experienced vocabulary instruction experienced major improvements in reading comprehension and overall reading skills with an effect size of 0.67." Vocabulary will be taught as a systematic approach to word awareness and understanding word roots with multiple exposure necessary for deeper learning.

rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the 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.

Vocabulary instruction will be scheduled into the ELA block for every grade level from K-5. Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure that vocabulary instruction is consistently administered to fidelity.

Person Responsible   Melicia Cooper (melicia.cooper@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will plan together each week to isolate the vocabulary words and practice the routine that will be presented in the vocabulary lesson for their grade level to ensure the consistent use of strategies and language.

Person Responsible   Carol Krietemeyer (carol.krietemeyer@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Math Proficiency has trended 50% and below since 2016. Only 38% of 3-5th grade students scored 3 or higher on the FSA in 2022. 5th grade students demonstrated higher learning achievement with 44% earning a 3 or higher.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	If we use math grade-level common assessment data to make daily instruction decisions, then our overall math proficiency will increase by 5%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine the progress of student mastery of the standard and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melicia Cooper (melicia.cooper@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will provide teachers Professional Development to learn new strategies and resources to help improve students' computational fluency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	According to Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategies, "Students who learn strategies for learning understand intention to use, consistency in appropriate use, and know when a chosen strategy is effective and self-regulate with an effect size of 0.62." There will be a focus on improving computational fluency through a variety of methods and resources.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will plan collaboratively weekly to structure the math lessons each week emphasizing improving computational fluency. Teachers will be provided with a number of vetted, standards-aligned, resources to use to plan each week's learning activities. There will be purposeful planning of embedded formative assessments to systematically monitor the entire classes' level of mastery of each lesson.

Person Responsible	Michelle Sage (michelle.sage@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students tasks and practice activities will be identified and delivered to the depth of the standard. Classrooms will be monitored regulary to ensure that computational fluency is consistently administered to fidelity.

Person Responsible	Melicia Cooper (melicia.cooper@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

Only 42 % of K-2 grade students scored 3 or higher on iReady AP3 in 2022.
K 53%
1st 43%
2nd 31%

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

ELA Proficiency has trended 40% and below since 2017. Only 35% of 3-5th grade students scored 3 or higher on the FSA in 2022.
3rd - 23%
4th - 37%
5th - 41%

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

If we provide all instructional staff Tier 1 reading instruction with an emphasis on small group instruction targeting fluency, phonics, and vocabulary, then our overall ELA proficiency will increase by 5%. When students can't read on grade level it affects students' ability to learn in all subjects.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

If we provide all instructional staff Tier 1 reading instruction with an emphasis on small group instruction targeting fluency, phonics, and vocabulary, then our overall ELA proficiency will increase by 5%. When students can't read on grade level it affects students' ability to learn in all subjects.

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.

Weekly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data such (such as iReady diagnostic, iReady progress monitoring, F.A.S.T, MTSS data, etc.) will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. 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 assessments results. As well as utilize formative assessment data to provide targeted small group instruction with administration monitoring weekly. The CAS will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and check for understanding.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cooper, Melicia, melicia.cooper@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 will participate in 10 minutes per day of explicit, vocabulary-based instruction in grades K-5. School-wide vocabulary instruction will be implemented as a systematic approach to word awareness and understanding of word roots to increase ELA proficiency.

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?

According to Hattie's index of Teaching & Learning Strategies, "Students who experienced vocabulary instruction experienced major improvements in reading comprehension and overall reading skills with an effect size of 0.67." Vocabulary will be taught as a systematic approach to word awareness and understanding word roots with multiple exposure necessary for deeper learning.

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
Vocabulary instruction will be scheduled into the ELA block for every grade level from K-5. Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure that vocabulary instruction is consistently administered to fidelity.	Cooper, Melicia, melicia.cooper@marion.k12.fl.us
Teachers will plan together each week to isolate the vocabulary words and practice the routine that will be presented in the vocabulary lesson for their grade level to ensure the consistent use of instructional strategies and language.	Krietemeyer, Carol, carol.krietemeyer@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 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.

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

Stakeholders include leadership team members, teachers, paraprofessionals, parents, and community members. 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. In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment, we will offer different modalities of communication to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal, and the school marquee.