Marion County Public Schools

Sparr Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sparr Elementary School

2525 E HWY 329, Anthony, FL 32617

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Renee Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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: B (57%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (42%)
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

Sparr Elementary School

2525 E HWY 329, Anthony, FL 32617

[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	47%

School Grades History

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

Our mission is to foster relationships with all stakeholders to remove barriers to student success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a nurturing learning community, committed to preparing young minds to be academically and socially competitive for college and career readiness.

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
Johnson, Renee	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader by overseeing all academic initiatives for Sparr. She supports instruction by facilitating collaboration and being present during classroom instruction. Furthermore, she provides consistent, quality learning opportunities for staff in an effort to enhance instructional practices and optimize resources. These efforts will in turn yield optimum learning opportunities for learners resulting in improved academic success for students.
Borge-Shaffer, Deborah	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal provides support for the vision and leadership of the principal by supporting Tier 1 instruction and learning opportunities. The assistant principal supports the collaborative process and follows through by seeing it through to impact during instruction. She provides coaching and learning opportunities for staff which yield enhanced instructional and learning opportunities.
Keene, Rachel	Math Coach	The instructional coach supports the staff and administration by serving as a content area expert. She supports instruction via co-teaching and coaching opportunities. Furthermore, she supports collaboration by serving as a content area expert and provides feedback and guidance in the development of high quality, Tier 1 instruction.
Urso, Dolores	Dean	The student services manager supports the overall academic goals of the school by providing organizational and behavioral management. She provides discipline support and serves as classroom management coach.
Schrader, Sarah	Reading Coach	The instructional coach supports the staff and administration by serving as a content area expert. She supports instruction via co-teaching and coaching opportunities. Furthermore, she supports collaboration by serving as a content area expert and provides feedback and guidance in the development of high quality, Tier 1 instruction.
Grubbs, Eva	School Counselor	The guidance counselor supports the mental health needs of students. She also supports behavioral and academic interventions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Renee Johnson

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.*
2

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

406

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

5

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	72	60	72	68	53	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	25	24	25	25	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	6	15	13	18	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Course failure in ELA	11	13	29	16	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in Math	14	10	34	18	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	3	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	17	30	24	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

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	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/18/2022

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	47	51	54	55	65	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	322
Attendance below 90 percent	12	13	20	14	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	7	4	12	17	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Course failure in ELA	11	11	33	16	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Course failure in Math	8	7	35	19	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	5	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	11	9	33	23	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

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	0	0	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	

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	47	51	54	55	65	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	322
Attendance below 90 percent	12	13	20	14	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	7	4	12	17	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Course failure in ELA	11	11	33	16	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Course failure in Math	8	7	35	19	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	5	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	11	9	33	23	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

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	0	0	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	

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%				36%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						54%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						66%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	50%	50%				43%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%						64%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						59%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	53%	59%				47%	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	26%	44%	-18%	58%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
05	2022					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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	31%	49%	-18%	62%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	45%	0%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	44%	-3%	53%	-12%
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	11	48	69	21	50	45	6				
ELL											
BLK	27	50	60	39	73	64	17				
HSP	48	64		52	71						
MUL	29	71		47	64						
WHT	45	61		59	65		56				
FRL	35	60	76	46	68	68	43				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	10	50		7	50						
BLK	28	30		22	60		20				
HSP	30	55		35	55						
MUL	33			25							
WHT	57	78		69	94		69				
FRL	40	58	60	41	68		36				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	8	56	67	12	58	58	30				
ELL	40			60							
BLK	27	53	67	27	76	75	30				
HSP	33	50		62	77						
MUL				30							
WHT	41	51	58	47	54	42	50				
FRL	34	57	68	40	66	60	52				

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	59
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	73
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	47
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	61
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	53
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	57
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	57
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?

The data indicates that learning gains among all students and learning gains among the bottom quartile have improved in both ELA and in math. From 2019 to 2021, ELA learning gains among all students increased from 54% to 59%. In 2022,learning gains increased by 1 more percent to 60%. In 2021, while learning gains among the bottom quartile dropped 2% to 64%. It increased to 69% in 2022.

Our math learning gains among all students increased from 40% to 64% from 2018 to 2019. In 2021 math learning gains increased to 69%, while math learning gains fell 1 percent to 68% in 2022. From 2018 to 2019, the learning gains among the bottom quartile increased from 35% to 59%, and in 2021 the learning gains among the bottom quartile jumped to 70%. Math learning gains among the bottom quartile fell 3 percentage points to 67% in 2022. The average learning gains in all students and the bottom quartile ELA learning gains among all student indicate a consistent, upward trend.

In proficiencies, math has remained stagnate in grades 3-5. During the 2017-2018 SY, the proficiency level was 44% and dropped to 43% in 2018-2019, while increasing in 2020-2021 to 46%. During 2021-2022, math achievement increased to 53%. Our ELA proficiency level was 47% in the 2017-2018 SY. The 2018-2019 proficiency percentage dropped to 36% while proficiency levels continued to climb to 42% in 2020-2021. Sparr saw a drop in overall ELA proficiency to a level of 40% in 2022.

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

The data indicates that the greatest area of need is ELA achievement. In ELA, student achievement dropped from 42% to 40% Furthermore, the 2022 FSA data reveals that in ELA, third-grade achievement levels were 3% lower than that of the district and 14% lower than the state average. Fourth-grade

achievement was 13% below the district and 20 percentage points lower than the state average. Fifth grade was 4% below the district average and 16% below the state average.

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

Some factors that contribute to the drop in student proficiency in both ELA include the lack of standards-based and aligned resources, curriculum, and lesson planning. Also, instruction and tasks were not at the appropriate rigor, Furthermore, collaborative planning was not being utilized to its fullest potential, therefore it was not having an optimal impact on Tier 1 instruction.

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

The data that showed the most improvement included the learning gains among all students and the learning gains among the bottom quartile in both ELA and in math.

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

Factors that contribute to this improvement include purposeful, small group support by personnel during instructional time.

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

Strategies to implement that will accelerate learning include purposeful small group instruction and a revision of the collaborative planning process. During the collaboration, there will be a focus on content that is aligned to the standard, engagement, and pacing, which will enhance Tier 1 instruction. Further, the use of the benchmark clarifications during collaboration will help ensure that instruction and tasks are at the appropriate rigor. These efforts will not only yield higher student achievement and proficiency, but it will continue the upward trend in learning gains among all students and among the bottom quartile.

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 opportunities will hone in on standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction (the instructional core, including task alignment, engagement, and pacing), and formative assessment for the purpose of data-based instructional decisions that will yield purposeful small group, standards-based instructional opportunities.

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

Administration and the instructional coaches will heavily support the collaboration process and tier 1 instruction. Teachers will be supported during collaboration, while all instructional items are appropriately vetted. Benchmark clarifications will be referenced to help ensure adequate rigor and alignment of content. The collaborative process will be facilitated and guided by administration and instructional coaches to ensure adequate learner engagement and pacing. Additionally, administration and coaches will inspect the implementation of the lessons during instruction, seeking evidence of collaboration, and will provide feedback on tier 1 instruction and coaching as needed.

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.	Goal: To increase learner ELA proficiency by improving and enhancing tier 1 instruction that is rigorous and appropriately aligned to the standard/benchmark. The need for increased ELA proficiency among learners reveals a critical need for enhanced Tier 1 instruction that includes instruction that is aligned to the standard and the appropriate rigor of the standard/benchmark. Our 2022 ELA progress monitoring (AP 3) data shows the following percent of grades K-2 students not proficient in their current grade level: 22% of Kindergarten, 66% of 1st grade, and 60% of 2nd grade. During the 2021-2022 school year, our ELA FSA data shows the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3: 61% of 3rd grade, 61% of 4th grade, and 59% of 5th grade. Improvements in the area of Tier 1 instruction will result in increased ELA proficiency among learners.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	If we provide students with rigorous ELA instruction that is aligned to the benchmark(s), including formative assessments, then proficiency will increase at least 5% in each grade level. Grades K-2 On the 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement, 78% of our kindergarten students were proficient, 34% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 40% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. On the 2022-23 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP 3 83% of kindergarten, 39% of 1st grade, and 45% of 2nd grade students will be proficient. Grades 3-5 On the 2022 ELA FSA, 39% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 39% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 41% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2023 ELA FSA , 44% of 3rd grade, 44% of 4th grade, and 46% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress: K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2022, AP2 January 2023, and AP3 May 2023. K-5: i-Ready Growth Monitoring November 2022 and March 2023 3-5: District DPMAs Q1 October 2022, Q2 December 2022, and Q3 March 2023. Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. During classroom walk throughs, levels of student engagement will be noted by administration and feedback will be provided to teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Johnson (renee.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based	The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is a revised collaborative planning process and professional development. Collaboration will include

Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	the utilization of test-item clarifications provided by the Florida Dept. of Education to help ensure that the tasks and lessons are aligned to the standard/benchmark and at the appropriate rigor level level and meeting two times per week with instructional coaches and administration. Professional development will include a focus on pacing and student engagement during direct instruction (.82 effect size on Hattie's index of teaching), and formative assessment (.9 effect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	During collaboration, teachers will have the opportunity to come together to share instructional strategies, learning goals, and tasks they plan to incorporate during the following week, This will be an opportunity for instructional coaches (content area experts) and administration (instructional leaders) to provide feedback in an effort to ensure standard/benchmark-based, rigor appropriate content and tasks and highly effective instructional practices prior to the execution of the lesson. Further, during this time teachers will share and analyze data collected from classroom-based common assessments to review best practices for review and remediation. Professional development will be provided to instructional staff on utilizing test item specifications for the purposes of task alignment and lesson planning. Further, professional development and coaching on pacing, student engagement, and formative assessment will be incorporated.

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.

Weekly classroom walkthroughs by administration seeking content and task alignment to the standard(s)/benchmark(s) and evidence of collaboration. Walkthroughs will be documents and data tracked weekly.

Person Responsible	Renee Johnson (renee.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social emotional and behavioral needs	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	A critical area of focus is the behavioral and social emotional needs of our students. During the 2021-2022 school year, Sparr saw 568 office discipline referrals. Of those referrals, over half of them occurred from students earning 3 or more office discipline referrals.38 students accounted for 368 office discipline referrals. This indicates a high need for intensive support for tier 2 and tier 3 students. Providing students and families with social and emotional support will increase student mental health, which will in turn have a positive impact on academics, parent involvement, and decrease undesirable behavior.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, Sparr will see a reduction in students who have >5 office discipline referrals by 25% (30 students or less).
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The multi-disciplinary team meets monthly to review discipline and SEL data, and develop individualized plans for social emotional or behavioral support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Borge-Shaffer (deborah.borge-shaffer@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The Multidisciplinary Team will meet regularly to review student data and make individual an plan of action for each student on Tier 2 or Tier 3 for SEL or discipline.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Support and coaching in the areas of appropriate response to social emotional needs will be provided.

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.

Review BESS survey data, monthly discipline referrals, threat assessments, and violence risk referrals during the monthly MDT meetings. Following the data review small groups, or one on one, mentoring and/or counseling sessions will be put into place.

Person Responsible	Eva Grubbs (eva.grubbs@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Goal: To increase learner ELA proficiency by improving and enhancing tier 1 instruction that is rigorous and appropriately aligned to the standard/benchmark.

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, kindergarten, first grade, and second grade will see a combined proficiency of 45% (or higher) as indicated by the Florida FAST.

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

Goal: To increase learner ELA proficiency by improving and enhancing tier 1 instruction that is rigorous and appropriately aligned to the standard/benchmark.

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, third, fourth, and fifth grade will see a combined proficiency of 45% (or higher) as indicated by the Florida FAST.

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)

On the 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic AP 3-Reading Overall Placement, 78% of our kindergarten students were proficient, 34% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 40% of our 2nd grade students were proficient.

On the 2022-23 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP 3 83% of kindergarten, 39% of 1st grade, and 45% of 2nd grade students will be proficient (5% higher for each grade level).

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

On the 2022 ELA FSA, 39% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 39% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 41% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher.

On the 2023 ELA FSA , 44% of 3rd grade, 44% of 4th grade, and 46% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher (5% higher for each grade level).

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.

In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:
K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2022, AP2 January 2023, and AP3 May 2023.
K-5: i-Ready Growth Monitoring November 2022 and March 2023
3-5: District DPMAs Q1 October 2022, Q2 December 2022, and Q3 March 2023.

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

During classroom walk throughs, levels of student engagement will be noted by administration and feedback will be provided to teachers.

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

Johnson, Renee, renee.johnson@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. §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 evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is a revised collaborative planning process for the purposes of enhanced tier 1 instruction. Collaboration will include the utilization of test-item clarifications provided by the Florida Dept. of Education to help ensure that the tasks and lessons are aligned to the standard/benchmark and at the appropriate rigor level level and meeting two times per week with instructional coaches and administration. Tier 1 instruction will be improved due to appropriate pacing and student engagement during direct instruction (.82 effect size on Hattie's index of teaching), and formative assessment (.9 effect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching).

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?

During collaboration, teachers will have the opportunity to come together to share instructional strategies, learning goals, and tasks they plan to incorporate during the following week, This will be an opportunity for instructional coaches (content area experts) and administration (instructional leaders) to provide feedback in an effort to ensure standard/benchmark-based, rigor appropriate content and tasks and highly effective instructional practices prior to the execution of the lesson. Further, during this time teachers will share and analyze data collected from classroom-based common assessments to review best practices for review and remediation.

Professional development will be provided to instructional staff on utilizing test item specifications for the purposes of task alignment and lesson planning. Further, professional development and coaching on pacing, student engagement, and formative assessment will be incorporated.

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
Action Step 1- Develop and implement professional learning opportunities that hone in on tier 1 needs. Tier 1 instruction will be consistently evaluated to identify trends and complete needs analyses. The data collected from tier 1 instruction observations will help determine focus and objectives for professional learning opportunities. Upon implementation, follow up will occur to inspect transference of intended skills to the classroom.	Johnson, Renee, renee.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us
Action Step 2- The Sparr Literacy team will meet monthly to evaluate student literacy assessment data (District Progress Monitoring Assessments, FAST assessments and i-Ready) and classroom observation data. This information will be used to determine the literacy focus and a plan for supported literacy coaching, based on needs, will be devised. The literacy coach will serve as the literacy leader by supporting tier 1 literacy instruction by coaching and modeling for teachers.	Schrader, Sarah, sarah.schrader@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.

Sparr Elementary continues to build a positive school culture and safe environment by creating norms, traditions, and beliefs. First, our mission and vision is created with the assistance of all stakeholders (students, staff, teachers, parents, School Advisory Committee and Sparr community). We build capacity by valuing our stakeholders and include them in the decision-making processes, including serving on committees. In addition, our committees set celebrations (both for students and adults), themes, and special events to elevate our positive culture.

The school will incorporate the new SEL curriculum, Caring Schools Community, each day. Each

stakeholder on campus works together to create a safe, positive school culture and environment for our learners. Each morning students engage in circle time, consistent with the parameters put forth by the Caring Schools curriculum, to begin the day on a positive, kind note. At the beginning and end of each day, Mrs. Johnson addresses the staff and students with a positive and encouraging message to see the students off.

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

All stakeholders (students, teachers, staff, administration, parents, volunteers, School Advisory Council, Sparr Building and Farm Supply (Business Partner) and the Sparr community) will play a role in promoting a positive culture and safe environment.

Our students will learn and exhibit the "BIG 3" (Do what's right, Do your best and treat other the way you want to be treated) each and everyday as an extension of our PBIS commitment.

Ms. Grubbs, Guidance Counselor, is the lead on the Caring Schools Community initiative and oversees the implementation.

Ms. Hinson, Student Service Manager, works with the students, staff, volunteers, and parents in the continuation and expansion of our PBIS program to continue to create and build a positive school culture and safe environment.