

Marion County Public Schools

Shady Hill Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Shady Hill Elementary School

5959 S MAGNOLIA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Anna Streater Mcallister

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	98%
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: B (54%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Shady Hill Elementary School

5959 S MAGNOLIA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	98%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at Shady Hill is to create an environment where ALL children, regardless of differences, will be able to succeed academically, physically, and emotionally to their maximum ability.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a positive, family-oriented and engaging environment where children will recognize and achieve their fullest potential.

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
Streater-McAllister, Anna	Principal	Oversees the day-to-day operations of the school including safety, operations, curriculum, and recruiting and retaining staff.
Lafferty, Shanon	Assistant Principal	Oversees the curriculum aspect of the school including standards-based instruction, assessment, intervention programs, and progress monitoring.
Sprung, Lisa	School Counselor	Oversees the well-being of students, Social Emotional Learning Program, Social Work services at the school level, and the IEP process for students with disabilities. The school counselor also assists with Problem solving and the MTSS process.
Albright, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Coordinates and oversees implementation of Reading instruction and Reading interventions. Provides training and coaching to staff in the area of Reading
Paxson, Matthew	Dean	Coordinates the school's Positive Behavior Intervention Program and handles school-wide discipline issues.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/27/2022, Anna Streater Mcallister

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.*

24

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

566

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

1

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	97	104	88	115	91	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	33	41	29	35	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	7	13	8	14	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA	17	25	25	12	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in Math	16	16	16	17	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	12	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	27	10	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	9	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	18	26	25	23	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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 8/12/2022

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	91	79	86	111	92	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	565
Attendance below 90 percent	29	23	21	25	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	13	5	2	16	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	14	17	24	17	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in Math	12	12	16	8	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	37	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	17	23	18	23	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	2	2	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	91	79	86	111	92	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	565
Attendance below 90 percent	29	23	21	25	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	13	5	2	16	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	14	17	24	17	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in Math	12	12	16	8	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	37	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	17	23	18	23	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	2	2	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	52%	47%	56%				57%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	61%				58%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	51%	52%				44%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	67%	54%	60%				68%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%	62%	64%				71%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	52%	55%				54%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	42%	51%				56%	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	51%	44%	7%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	49%	9%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	45%	7%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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	59%	49%	10%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	54%	21%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	59%	45%	14%	60%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	44%	9%	53%	0%
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	14	23	21	26	38	33	17				
ELL	32	50		53	56						
BLK	18	23	17	30	48	45	14				
HSP	50	58	37	63	68	53	17				
MUL	55	67		85	75						
WHT	61	59	58	75	73	59	58				
FRL	35	49	37	54	62	50	21				
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	23	50	62	38	53	50	7				
ELL	31			46							
BLK	25	47		34	50		8				
HSP	39	65		66	76		36				
MUL	62			67							
WHT	67	70		82	76	70	68				
FRL	40	65	74	54	64	65	30				
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	30	41	29	40	61	52	36				
ELL	29	30		59	85						
BLK	22	40	29	38	51	38	20				
HSP	54	57	45	70	77	75	52				
MUL	68	75		68	80		60				
WHT	68	61	48	76	73	52	69				
FRL	40	53	49	53	64	53	40				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
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%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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

In 3rd grade ELA our students were at 42% (-8), 4th was at 71 (+32), and 5th grade was at 40 (-28). For math our 3rd grade was at 54% (-25), 4th was at 46% (-3), and 5th was at 52% (+1). Our fourth graders are a strong cohort but our 3rd graders need strong support in both areas. Our 5th grade students were stronger in math headed to middle school , but showed a deficit in ELA .

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

Third grade shows the greatest need for improvement. If instructional alignment occurs in the classroom, and formative assessment aligns with task for learning, then students will be able to show growth. Planning and collaboration within grade levels with intentional lessons to address standards will encourage robust Tier 1 instruction.

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

Factors may include the need for specific small group instruction with tasks aligned to the B. E. S. T. standards. Our school will continue with the Area of Focus for this year to increase effective Formative Assessment in the classroom, which will allow teachers to target skills needed by specific students. Teachers will collaborate and receive professional development in the use of Formative Assessment which will allow teachers to identify gaps and the needs of individual students. The small groups will then be formed to differentiate the instruction in order to allow for remediation and enrichment.

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

Fourth grade data showed the most improvement in ELA with a 32 point increase. Fourth grade math lost 3 points which was the lowest in loss.

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

The fourth grade team plans in a collaborative effort, and they unpack standards to ensure students learn every aspect of the standard. They use district approved resources to teach , and their formative assessment.

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

Intentional planning and collaboration will be implemented this year. Administration will divide grade levels, and collaborate with the grade levels and the content area specialist.

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 in the areas of formative assessment and collaboration will be ongoing this year for teachers. We will host TEACH Tuesdays where formative assessment strategies will be demonstrated to teachers to use in their classrooms.

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

By continuing and adopting the structured planning and collaboration, and keeping it as practice, building teacher capacity with collaboration will assist in ensuring sustainability for the next year and beyond.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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.

The daily attendance averaged 90% for the 21-22 school year. Understanding that attendance is a critical piece for student achievement, we will work with families to increase our attendance rate which will in turn increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific

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

Shady Hill will increase the daily attendance rate by %4 going from 90% to 94% for the average daily rate of attendance.

Monitoring:

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

The attendance clerk will run daily reports and work closely with the Home School Liaison to have families' needs met to support attendance. The counselor will conduct CSTs to support the needs of students with high absenteeism.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Sprung (lisa.sprung@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The evidenced-based strategy relating to student achievement is parental involvement under home effects. By valuing and incorporating families into the academic needs of the students there will be a unified team approach to the success of the student which will result in increased attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The rationale for the positive culture is directly related to parental involvement which has a .51 influence according to Hattie's ranking of home effects related to student achievement.

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.

The first action step will be to have a Parent Family Event during which the importance of attendance is highlighted and incentives will be given.

Person Responsible

Lisa Sprung (lisa.sprung@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

From the data reviewed and gathered from the FSA and I-Ready assessments, it is apparent that structured collaborative planning is a must to implement formative assessment for Tier 1 instruction. Students must have ample opportunity to show mastery of the skills taught in classrooms during instruction. Data from various types of formative assessment(i.e. checklists, peer review, self reflection,) will be gathered to determine differentiated groups and remediation that should take place during Tier 1 instruction.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency will increase from 52% to 59% as measured by the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Through on-going professional development, teachers will be able to build capacity with using the data collected from formative assessment, and plan intentionally to address the task aligned with the standards.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anna Streater-McAllister (anna.streater-mcallister@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The evidence based strategy is the data collected from formative assessment to make Teachers will be able to analyze data to make instructional decisions in the classroom that are intentional for data driven instructional decisions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The academic focus for the 21-22 school year was formative assessment. The academic focus for the 22-23 school year is to use the data from the formative assessments to drive instructional decisions in the classroom. The planning and collaboration will allow for data analysis of the formative assessments results. Teachers will be able to plan intentional differentiated or remediation activities for students.

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 bring the results of data which they have recorded and analyzed. Data will be discussed, and collaboration between teachers, the content area specialist, and administrators will occur. Planning using district approved resources will take place to ensure that the structure of the lessons are addressing the task, which are aligned to the standard. Differentiated instruction and remediation lesson will be planned to address student needs.

Person

Responsible

Shanon Lafferty (shanon.lafferty@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

The iReady reading proficiency percentage levels for the 2021-2022 school year are the following:

Kindergarten is 79%

First Grade is 48%

2nd grade is at 53%

Our area of focus will utilize collaborative planning to facilitate the strategy of formative assessments, and using the data to plan for specific targeted instruction.

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

In 3rd grade ELA our students were at 42% (-8), 4th was above the 50% goal reaching 71 (+32), and 5th grade was at 40% (-28). Our area of focus will utilize collaborative planning to facilitate the strategy of formative assessments, and using the data to plan for specific targeted instruction.

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)

Kindergarten will increase from 79% to 83% in 2023 as measured by the STAR assessment
First Grade will increase from 48% to 55% in 2023 as measured by the
Second grade will increase from 53% to 58% in 2023

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our 22-23 3rd grade students will meet the 50% goal, our 22-23 4th grade students will increase by 8% to meet the 50% goal, and our 22-23 5th grade students will retain their percentage of 71%.

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.

Teachers will collaborate and develop formative assessments that will be implemented in the classroom. Administrators and coaches will provide specific feedback to teachers on their practice. Data from district assessments and standards checks will provide additional data to be used in the weekly collaborative planning sessions. Additional outcomes from state testing will reveal growth in ELA FAST measurements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Albright, Stephanie, stephanie.albright@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?

Every week teachers will be collaborate and plan lessons based on the B.E.S.T. benchmarks. Planning and collaboration is vital to ensure that quality instruction takes place in the classroom. The CAS will facilitate the planning and collaboration with administration. Tasks and activities will meet the depth of the benchmark, ensuring formative assessment provided a true depiction of understanding. data gathered from the formative assessment will drive intentional instruction for differentiation and remediation.

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 specified data from formative assessment will assist in addressing differentiation and remediation of skills during Tier 1 instruction. The facilitation of planning and collaboration by the CAS and administration will assist teachers to determine the best methods of formative assessment to capture the data.

The district's reading curriculum, curriculum maps, supplemental resources and strategies are the best practices that will be implemented to address robust Tier 1 instruction.

Action Steps to Implement:

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy coaching will assist and coaching cycles will be used for those classrooms where the need is great as determined by the data collected from the assessments administered.	Streater-McAllister, Anna, anna.streater-mcallister@marion.k12.fl.us
Professional Learning on data analysis and formative assessments will be ongoing throughout the year.	Albright, Stephanie, stephanie.albright@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.

Shady Hill Elementary prides itself on involving stakeholders in the decision-making process, and in participating in activities around our campus. We welcome and encourage families to stay involved and volunteer. With a Positive Behavior Support plan in place and a multitude of opportunities for the upcoming school year, there will be a variety of activities that parents will be involved and engaged. Additionally, quarterly School Advisory Council meetings will be held where parents, community members, and business partners are invited. We will host two parent conference nights for family engagement. We will be piloting family engagement strategies learned at the Family Engagement conference with Dr. Karen Mapp at Harvard University.

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

Business partners stay involved by attending and participating in School Advisory Council meetings, attending festivals and performances, providing resources for our staff and students, and by supporting our school's mission and vision. Community members are encouraged to tour our campus and learn about our school. They can often be found reading to students or presenting at Career Day. Family members attend School Advisory Council meetings, Parent Conference Night, other Family Nights, and volunteer at a variety of events. School board members attend SAC meetings, and district personnel visit classrooms. Our local grocery store invites students in for a Publix Math Night, where students and their families use the products to solve math problems.