

Marion County Public Schools

Stanton Weirsdale 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

Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School

16705 SE 134TH TER, We IR Sdale, FL 32195

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Brodie

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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 (46%) 2018-19: C (44%) 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

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

Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School

16705 SE 134TH TER, We IR Sdale, FL 32195

[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	34%

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.

We are united in challenging students to reach their fullest potential in a safe, positive, caring environment which is conducive to teaching and learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a community school for student-centered learning that provides a family-friendly environment in order to develop successful and well-rounded global leaders.

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
Brodie, Cynthia	Principal	The principal oversees the day to day operations of the school. The principal also supports teachers and staff with curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning.
Parks, Megan	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports teachers and staff with curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning.
Alderman, Amy	Instructional Coach	Our content area specialist supports teachers and students with the delivery of ELA curriculum.
Tucker, Doris	Dean	Our student service manager develops and supports a school-wide positive behavior system and handles student discipline. She also puts into place processes and procedures that support student safety on campus.
Carson, Georgiana	Instructional Coach	Our content area specialist supports teachers and students with the delivery of Math curriculum.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Cynthia Brodie

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

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

501

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

2

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

3

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	77	67	90	100	66	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	488
Attendance below 90 percent	44	29	26	41	20	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	8	1	6	13	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	24	8	29	16	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
Course failure in Math	18	6	27	9	24	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	44	24	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	42	19	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	17	21	22	46	38	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184

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	24	8	26	16	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	73	83	82	75	85	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	482
Attendance below 90 percent	42	34	33	34	39	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
One or more suspensions	5	7	6	15	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	12	18	29	20	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in Math	11	23	31	24	26	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	19	9	24	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	27	38	30	32	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180

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	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	73	83	82	75	85	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	482
Attendance below 90 percent	42	34	33	34	39	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
One or more suspensions	5	7	6	15	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	12	18	29	20	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in Math	11	23	31	24	26	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	19	9	24	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	27	38	30	32	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180

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	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	33%	46%	56%				43%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						52%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						38%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	42%	50%	50%				46%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						49%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						33%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	53%	59%				50%	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	28%	44%	-16%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	45%	3%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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	35%	49%	-14%	62%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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	12	43	50	29	56	52	6				
ELL	10	36		15	57						
BLK	26	45		11	9						
HSP	32	56		41	65		33				
WHT	36	50	53	47	66	62	35				
FRL	28	48	58	36	60	50	30				
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	36		12	41	54	8				
ELL	21			42							
BLK	14			31							
HSP	32	50		46	50		41				
WHT	42	59	80	46	50	70	42				
FRL	30	53	71	36	52	67	34				
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	23	38	35	30	44	44	44				
ELL	23	38		27	38						
BLK	33	40		33	30						
HSP	43	53		45	49		56				
MUL	60			47							
WHT	42	51	32	47	50	34	49				
FRL	38	53	36	41	45	30	43				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	23
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	47
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	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

The data indicates scores on ELA proficiency continue to decrease from 2018/2019 to current 2022 from 43% to 33% overall. Math proficiency continues to decrease from 48% to 42% proficiency. Lowest quartile students are making gains in both ELA from 31% in 2018 to 58% in 2022 and Math gains from 36% to 50%.

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

Reading is an area of need when looking at our data since 2018. Each year proficiency has decreased which shows an area of improvement school-wide. Our ELA proficiency rates are not improving.

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

Tier I reading instruction and differentiation planning were not being used to their full potential. Tier I instruction is lacking addressing all six areas of reading and the individual needs of students. New actions to be taken this year are focusing on strong Tier I reading instruction planning with task alignment to the B.E.S.T. standards based in grades K-5 as well as a foundational skill focus in grades K-2. We will plan for small group instruction targeting fluency, vocabulary, phonics, and comprehension. Training will be provided on Close Reading strategies as well as guided reading school-wide. Teachers will utilize Close Reading in all grade levels to help students dissect text for better reading comprehension as students learn to read and read to learn.

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

Progress was made in Math learning gains from 49% to 60%.

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

The math instructional block was 70-75 minutes depending on grade level which allows for math intervention to be built in. The addition of Reflex Math allowed students math fluency practice on a daily basis.

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

High order questioning and writing across all subject areas where students have to read, think, and write will help students think critically which in turn will help accelerate learning. Close reading strategies taught in reading, math, and science will be expected of students to use.

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 skill sets with strategies to teach the standards and address remediation of a student's individual needs. During collaboration strategies for vocabulary and comprehension will be focused on as well as standard aligned instruction. Teachers will work together weekly to structure their lessons utilizing the gradual release model. We will conduct learning walks in classrooms with a specific focus on Tier I reading instruction and provide feedback to teachers. We will train teachers in utilizing high order questioning strategies in weekly collaboration as they plan questions for instruction.

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

Collaboration will be targeted on the greatest impact in reading and math. The administrative team will complete weekly walkthroughs looking for trends and implementation of instruction based on collaborative planning. Walkthrough forms will be kept where leadership can assess trends by grade levels see how teachers are progressing with their skillset and provide feedback to the teachers.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus
Description and****Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

After reviewing data from the last four years on our district assessments, state assessment data, and classroom assessment data it is evident we need to work on planning for Tier I reading instruction with an emphasis on foundational skills instruction and task alignment. When students can't read on grade level it affects students' ability to learn in all subject areas.

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

Proficiency in the area of ELA will increase by 5% on the 2023 F.A.S.T. The increased proficiency in ELA will also increase math proficiency by 5% on the 2023 F.A.S.T. and science proficiency will improve by 5% on the 2023 NGSSS Science assessment.

**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, F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring, MTSS data, etc.), will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will utilize well-planned checks for understanding and other formative assessment data to provide targeted small group instruction with administration monitoring implementation weekly. The CAS in Literacy and Math will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and check for understanding.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

Professional development on student achievement (.51 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategies) and strategies to teach foundational skills will be provided. Through PLCs, collaboration meetings, and staff development opportunities teachers will learn how to increase students' vocabulary to explain their thinking and increase opportunities for students to initiate questions in class discussions. Teachers will collaboratively plan using standards-based resources and planning for high order questioning in whole group and small group instruction. Teachers will plan for remedial and small group instruction with students in collaborative planning twice per week with content

implemented for this Area of Focus.

area specialists and administration. Teachers will increase students' opportunities for writing, class discussions, and reading through all subject areas. This strategy will be regularly monitored as teachers use checks for understanding through brief writing opportunities for students to explain their thinking and understanding in all subject areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Research shows that students who have increased opportunities for writing and reading in all areas, increase their overall abilities in all subjects. We will use ELA textbook adopted curriculum SAVVAS, and iReady Teacher Toolbox lessons, Top Score Writing curriculum, Social Studies, STEMscopes, DBQ's, interactive notebooks, differentiated instruction using check for understanding data, and multiple intervention resources to improve learning gains. In addition, research shows that planned, explicit, and rigorous Tier 1 instruction, along with task alignment, increases student learning in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Professional development will be provided to all instructional and classroom based non-instructional staff on reading strategies, programs being used in classrooms, high order questioning, vocabulary, and class discussion techniques. Professional development will be provided to all classroom based non-instructional staff on the SAVVAS reading program.

Person Responsible

Amy Alderman (amy.alderman@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

Student engagement is a direct area of focus because our overall FSA ELA proficiency is 33% and Math is 42%. The SWD subgroup in 2022 was below the 41% requirement at 35%, Black/African American subgroup in 2022 was below the requirement at 23%, and ELL subgroup in 2022 was below the requirement at 35%. Student engagement is key to students understanding and comprehending text.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

If student engagement practices are in alignment with standard based learning, then overall
ELA proficiency will increase by 5% minimum from 33% to 38% and Math proficiency will increase by 5% minimum from 42% to 47%. The SWD, Black/African American, and ELL subgroup target goal is 41%.

Monitoring:

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

Professional development will be provided during weekly faculty meetings as well as through collaboration which meets twice a week for 45 minutes each with a focus on ELA and Math. Implementation of student engagement strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, ESOL para utilizing strategies when working directly with specific students, students creating goals with teachers, data chats with students and staff, parent communication and reports.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

During collaboration, teachers with administration and Literacy and Math coach will create planned lessons for student engagement and collaborative learning. Resources will include, peer tutoring, peer conversations, Kagan Structures, and an element of teaching students to teach their parents through parent engagement events.

Rationale for

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

John Hattie of "Visible Learning" states research shows class discussion has a 0.82 high effect size and cooperative learning has a 0.55 high effect size. Students being taught the skills to collaborative work together, problem solve, and encourage one another to be engaged, is impactful and will show gains in learning. Bill Daggett research states, "In cross-age peer learning... raises academic mastery and metacognitive processes." (Peer Learner Engagement, International Center for Leadership in Education.

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.

Administration will work with content area specialists, home school liaison, and teachers in creating meaningful parent events that incorporate students teaching their parents strategies/structures that can be utilized at home throughout the school year

Person Responsible Megan Parks (megan.parks@marion.k12.fl.us)

Literacy Content Area Specialist will work with teachers in collaboration, after school, professional learning communities, etc. to provide examples and instruction on how to set up student engagement structures in the classroom. CAS will model and monitor for effectiveness.

Person Responsible Amy Alderman (amy.alderman@marion.k12.fl.us)

Math Content Area Specialist will work with teachers in collaboration, after school, professional learning communities, etc. to provide examples and instruction on how to set up student engagement structures in the classroom. CAS will model and monitor for effectiveness.

Person Responsible Georgiana Carson (georgiana.carson@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

2021-2022 iReady Progress Monitoring data of K-2 students revealed 88% of Kindergarten, 81% of 1st grade, and 84% of 2nd grade are below proficiency.

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

The 2022 ELA FSA data shows the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3 of proficiency: 70% of 3rd grade, 63% of 4th grade, and 66% of 5th grade.

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 the focus of collaboration, planning, and professional development is on structured Tier 1 instruction including foundational skills then over proficiency will increase 12% to 50% in Kindergarten, 19% to 50% in 1st grade, and 16% to 50% in 2nd grade.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

If the focus of collaboration, planning, and professional development is on structured Tier 1 instruction with fidelity and consistency, then overall proficiency of students will increase from 30% to 55% in 3rd grade, 37% to 55% in 4th grade, and 34% to 55% in 5th grade.

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.

Professional development will be provided at faculty meetings and collaboration twice a week for forty-five minutes each with a focus on ELA and Math. Implementation of instructional strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, ESE/ESOL para utilizing strategies when working directly with specific students, students creating goals with teachers, data chats with students and staff, parent communication and reports. Teachers and leadership team have classroom and school action plans that are reviewed every twenty days as part of the monitoring process and data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brodie, Cynthia, cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

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

The evidence-based programs being utilized to support instruction and remediation are aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, part of the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan, and are identified as evidence-based programs that meet Florida's requirements.

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 evidence-based practices/programs being utilized meet the ESSA requirements for interventions and address the educational need of students. John Hattie of "Visible Learning" states research shows class discussion has a 0.82 high effect size, cooperative learning has a 0.55 high effect size, and direct instruction with a 0.59 effect size. Students being taught the skills to collaborative work together, problem solve, and encourage one another to be engaged, is impactful and will show gains in 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
Literacy Content Area Specialist (LCAS) will work with teachers in collaboration, after school, professional learning communities, etc. to provide examples and instruction on how to set up student engagement structures in the classroom. The LCAS will provide professional development on the programs being utilized for remediation of skills and basic foundational instruction (K-2). LCAS will model and monitor for effectiveness.	Alderman, Amy, amy.alderman@marion.k12.fl.us
Administration will work with content area specialists, home school liaison, and teachers in creating meaningful parent events that incorporates students teaching their parents strategies/structures that can be utilized at home throughout the school year. Supporting parents through instruction of foundational skills will support student learning in the home.	Carson, Georgiana, georgiana.carson@marion.k12.fl.us
Progress monitoring and data review meetings to address student outcomes and track student performance will take place with administration after each progress monitoring assessment. Administration and teachers will create action plans for individual students not meeting the proficiency target for the grade level and track the data and make adjustments as needed. Students will be placed in remediation and specific direct instruction opportunities based on the data.	Brodie, Cynthia, cynthia.brodie@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.

School staff will promote a positive learning environment with implementation of the Caring School Community SEL program and the implementation of our PBIS program. The school administrative team along with a committee of staff volunteers promote positive culture by recognizing school staff throughout the year as well as promoting themed days for both staff and students to celebrate learning in a safe environment. The administrative team, teachers, and paraprofessionals will plan and implement parent night events that will build the capacity of parents/guardians/caregivers and students to promote a healthy socio-psychological environment and increase intellectual stimulation in the home.

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

Stanton-Weirsdale Elementary School is a community based school which has partnerships with community groups. The school also has a Business Partner that meets regularly with administration to determine how it may continue to best support the school with resources. The School Advisory Council meets minimum four

times a year to address current data, curriculum, and needs of the students, staff, and community and decisions are made through the council. The staff meets minimum once a month in committees to address the various areas of the school campus to determine strengths and needs to be worked on. The school encompasses common language to instill a positive culture on campus as well as a growth mindset in all classrooms. There is a community Care Closet where families can request household support, students can get shoes and clothes, and food when needed to help provide a well-rounded environment for all students.