Wyomina Park Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wyomina Park Elementary School

511 NE 12TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34470

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Victoria Hunt

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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Wyomina Park Elementary School

511 NE 12TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34470

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

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.

To learn and lead by empowering all stakeholders to access the skills required to fully develop as successful citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learn and lead to succeed.

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.**:**

Part I: School Information

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hunt, Victoria	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school. They work with stakeholders to develop a shared vision and mission for the school. They guide and work with the leadership team to analyze student data to monitor student progress to drive instruction and provide curriculum resources aligned to the Florida standards; develop a program that promotes professional development based on evaluations and feedback to retain an effective/highly effective staff, and build relationships with parents and the community.
Greenbaum, Howard	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through their expertise in curriculum and analyzing student data to drive decision-making for instruction. The assistant principal also supports the teachers by using evaluations and observations to determine staff needs in professional development and instructional support through mentoring, modeling, and coaching.
Eatmon, Susan	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through their expertise in curriculum and analyzing student data to drive decision-making for instruction. The assistant principal also supports the teachers by using evaluations and observations to determine staff needs in professional development and instructional support through mentoring, modeling, and coaching.
Von Ohlen, Nancy	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist for mathematics provides expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff; uses leading/lagging student data and/or staff surveys to provide professional development opportunities; and/or supports students by modeling instructional strategies.
Macias, Lisa	Dean	The student service manager primarily works with the principal to develop guidelines for proper student conduct, disciplinary policies, and procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning. They maintain visibility and accessibility on the school campus and at school-related activities and events during the work day. They also work with the school counselor to effectively support students with problem-solving and coping with becoming productive citizens within our community.
Slagle, Mary	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist for reading provides expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff; uses leading/lagging student data and/or staff surveys to provide professional development opportunities; and/or supports students by modeling instructional strategies.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Victoria Hunt

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

602

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

19

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

8

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	105	109	88	117	72	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	57	49	37	50	22	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256
One or more suspensions	14	30	19	37	28	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
Course failure in ELA	26	53	40	50	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208
Course failure in Math	27	43	31	42	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	25	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	49	33	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	14	10	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	33	56	36	54	26	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	0	1	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 7/11/2022

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	117	101	91	97	88	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	52	44	34	41	34	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
One or more suspensions	15	14	15	29	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Course failure in ELA	29	31	31	37	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
Course failure in Math	29	38	25	36	25	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	16	27	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	34	40	37	53	38	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	233

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	1	0	22	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	117	101	91	97	88	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	52	44	34	41	34	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
One or more suspensions	15	14	15	29	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Course failure in ELA	29	31	31	37	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
Course failure in Math	29	38	25	36	25	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	16	27	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	34	40	37	53	38	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	233

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	1	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	37%	46%	56%				34%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						48%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						44%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	35%	50%	50%				32%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	54%						60%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						59%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	23%	53%	59%				42%	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	21%	44%	-23%	58%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	49%	-13%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

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	24%	49%	-25%	62%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	64%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	45%	-6%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	38%	44%	-6%	53%	-15%
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	9	46	52	10	38	55	10				
ELL	25			58	90						
BLK	32	59	68	25	48	64	18				
HSP	36	56		39	68		23				
MUL	33			18							
WHT	46	57		49	53		26				
FRL	35	60	66	32	52	61	23				
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	14	63		13	18		27				
ELL	16			30							
BLK	17	50	70	20	36		10				
HSP	20	40		24	50						
MUL	33			27							
WHT	40	63		44	58		55				
FRL	23	52	73	24	45	40	21				
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	7	32	15	3	64	67	10				
ELL	6	31		6	68	80					
BLK	30	53	56	26	55	60	40				
HSP	23	39		29	67	67	42				
MUL	43			36							
WHT	41	48	30	38	56		47				
FRL	30	44	41	28	57	56	37				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	26
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	46
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

Student performance using grade-level progress monitoring tools consistently demonstrated student performance below 38% proficiency across all grade levels for both ELA and Math. FSA Achievement levels over three years averaged 33% for ELA and 32% for Math, placing our students at least 20% below state averages in both core content areas.
The ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities, has trended below 41% for the past two years.

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

An analysis of 2021-2021 i-Ready reading and math proficiency data demonstrated the most significant deficits in proficiency in our rising fifth graders. This creates an urgency to correct this as these students affect our 2023 FAST state assessment. I-Ready diagnostic data reflects proficiency levels below 30% across all grade levels from first to fifth.

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

We found that in both ELA and math, student practice tasks were not consistently aligned with the instructional level of rigor and complexity to meet the demands of the grade-level standard. Providing students with grade-level tasks with scaffolded instruction would improve overall math and ELA achievement.

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

Third grade demonstrated a 13% increase in math achievement from Spring 2022, and 4th grade an 13% increase in ELA achievement from 2022.

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

During collaborative planning, teachers worked together to develop standards-based instruction to support the needs of all students.

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

School-wide grade level collaborative planning focused on improving Tier 1 instruction will continue to be improved in all subjects to make it more impactful for the teachers and students. Tier 1 math lessons will be structured in a gradual release model with student learning activities aligned to the depth of the standard in rigor and complexity.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be offered during collaborative planning as teachers develop skillsets with strategies to deliver quality Tier 1 instruction. They will examine common assessments and use that data to drive their next steps. Professional development will also be offered during collaborative planning for instructional strategies to accelerate learning in reading through student practice aligned to the depth and rigor of the grade-level standards. Teachers will plan collaboratively and receive professional development to structure reading lessons with the reading coach each week.

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

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

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	3-5 ELA proficiency has trended below 40% since 2016. Only 35% of rising 3rd and 4th-grade students scored three or higher on the FSA in 2022.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	If teachers use data from school-based common grade-level assessments and the state progress monitoring system to plan for Tier 1 instruction and strategically place students into interventions, then ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase 10% in each grade level. 3rd grade: 33% to 43% 4th grade: 38% to 48% 5th grade 36% to 46%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	State Progress Monitoring Assessments and District Benchmark Assessments will be used to help us monitor our progress to the desired outcome. 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. We will also monitor the effectiveness of implementation using classroom walkthrough observational data and other assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Victoria Hunt (victoria.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will be provided professional development in BEST Standards, acceleration instructional strategies, and purposeful ongoing formative assessment. We will follow up on these professional learning opportunities by conducting focused formative walkthroughs with the leadership team to gauge the implementation of these practices. According to John Hattie's research, in his Index of Teaching, teacher use of formative evaluations has a .90 effect size. The highest effects are seen when teachers seek evidence of where students aren't doing well.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for	Through evidence collected in doing classroom walkthroughs, it was found that Tier 1 instruction is inconsistent among grade levels. Therefore, in addition to improving our collaborative planning process, we are focusing on improving teachers' Tier 1 instruction across grade levels. Specifically, we will concentrate on BEST Standards, instructional acceleration strategies, and purposeful ongoing formative assessment.

**selecting this
strategy.**

Develop a professional development plan with the leadership team to emphasize Tier 1 goals. Specifically, we will focus our professional development efforts on giving the teachers the tools to design standards-aligned instruction that provides opportunities to check the students' understanding and accelerate learning.

**Person
Responsible**   Victoria Hunt (victoria.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

SELA collaborative weekly meetings will support teachers in reaching our Tier 1 instructional goals. Coaches, administrators, and teachers will collaborate during these weekly meetings to develop instructional delivery strategies. The teachers will be provided with vetted, standards-aligned resources to plan each week's learning activities. Coaches will also support the teachers in the purposeful planning of embedded formative assessments to systematically monitor the entire class's level of mastery of each lesson. This collected data will also be discussed and compared between teachers in each grade level weekly at collaborative planning meetings to help guide future instruction.

**Person
Responsible**   Mary Slagle (mary.slagle@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	ESSA subgroup for students with disabilities has trended below 41% for two consecutive years. According to the federal index, this subgroup is currently 28%,
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	If teachers provide effective differentiated instruction and strategic interventions in reading and math to address student/subgroup needs, then proficiency levels will improve by 10%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The administration team members will monitor the State Progress Monitoring Assessments and District Benchmark Assessments of students with disabilities throughout the year. The results will identify students' needs (trends, specific areas of weakness, and support the selection of interventions). In addition, the results will provide information to guide instructional support (professional development, the coaching cycle, and curricular support for teachers and paraprofessionals).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Victoria Hunt (victoria.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We will track our students' performance in several ways. Teachers will follow student performance by using formative and summative assessments. The administration team will work with teachers to track student performance through PMP meetings. In addition, the administration will create a data wall to track and monitor targeted students' performance on district/state assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	All stakeholders will use the high effect size of tracking student performance. Administrators, staff, and students must regularly follow student performance to support interventions. Data needs to be collected and analyzed to make well-informed decisions for instructional delivery (on-below-above level) for all subgroups.

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 students will be progress monitored throughout the year. Examples include grades, progress monitoring meetings, assessments, student self-monitoring, standards checklists, etc.

Person Responsible	Victoria Hunt (victoria.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students will receive differentiated interventions 30 minutes twice a day, five days a week, during the MTSS blocks. The administration/leadership team and teachers will monitor this student subgroup percentile in ELA and mathematics.

Person Responsible	Mary Slagle (mary.slagle@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

According to i-Ready diagnostic data used to screen K-2 students in the spring of 2022, students measuring early, mid, or above on grade level are as follows:
• Kindergarten 85%
• First Grade 38%
• Second Grade 39%

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

63% of students in grades 3-5 at Wyomina Park are below a level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

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 students in grades K-2 receive explicit and systematic foundation instruction, then we will increase the number of students measuring early, mid, or above grade level by 10%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

If students in grades 3-5 receive standards-aligned instruction using grade-level text and instructional acceleration strategies, then we will be able to increase the number of students scoring a level 3 or above by 10%.

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.

State Progress Monitoring Assessments and District Benchmark Assessments will be used to help us monitor our progress to the desired outcome. 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. In addition, the administration team will host student progress monitoring meetings with teachers three times a year.

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

Hunt, Victoria, victoria.hunt@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?

Students in grades K-2 will use the U.F.L.I. Foundation Curriculum to support foundation instruction at the Tier I level. This program is aligned with the science of reading and is supported by Just Read Florida. The instructional materials are aligned with the B.E.S.T. E.L.A. Standards.

Students in grades 3-5 will use district-created lesson plans to align the adopted instructional resources to the new B.E.S.T. E.L.A. Standards. In collaborative planning, we will discuss high-effect instructional delivery strategies.

Both elements are aligned with the district Reading plan.

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?

Direct instruction has an effect size of 0.59 (Hattie, 2009)
Phonics Instruction has an effect size of 0.60 (Visible Learning, 2019)

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 Leadership: A school-based literacy leadership team will meet monthly to discuss the progress of our school's measurable goals.	Hunt, Victoria, victoria.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coaching: The literacy content specialist and administrative team implement a coaching cycle based on collected classroom data from state, district, and classroom data.	Slagle, Mary, mary.slagle@marion.k12.fl.us

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a crucial role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:
• A description and explanation of the school's curriculum
• Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress
• Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet
• Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact
• Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so
• Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and participate in decisions about the education of their children
• Allow for feedback and open discussion.

To increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment, we will offer different options (online and paper-based) of communication for our families, such as scheduled meetings, phone calls, emails, ClassDojo/Remind App posts/messaging, Twitter posts, virtual meetings via Zoom/Microsoft Teams, the school's website, teacher web-pages Skyward Family Access and our school marquee.

Family and community feedback are requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys, and school-wide Improvement Plan surveys.

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

We have many stakeholders who contribute to and impact promoting positive school culture and environment here at Wyomina Park Elementary School.

• Students impact the culture and environment by being engaged in learning.
• Parents impact their partnership with the school to ensure successful student learning.
• Teachers provide the delivery of instruction through the development of engaging and relevant lesson plans and activities/assignments.
• The administrators ensure that the school environment is conducive to learning and are instructional leaders. Instructional leadership is based on data-driven decisions to support the building capacity of the instructional staff and resources.
• The business partner supports the school through career awareness and by providing funding are supplemental resources.
• The community provides volunteer hours and donations of funds and/or supplemental resources.