

Marion County Public Schools

East Marion Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

East Marion Elementary School

14550 NE 14TH STREET RD, Silver Springs, FL 34488

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Dobbs

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2022

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* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (37%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

East Marion Elementary School

14550 NE 14TH STREET RD, Silver Springs, FL 34488

[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	19%

School Grades History

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

The mission at East Marion Elementary (EME) is to work within our school community to create an environment that encourages our students to take ownership of their learning with the end goal for all students to become critical thinkers, problem solvers, and life-long learners as a result of rigorous and effective instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At East Marion Elementary (EME), our purpose for the future of our students is to work with all stakeholders to provide and support a safe learning environment that delivers relevant instruction for all students. As part of that vision, we will focus on including purposeful, authentic learning opportunities that allow all students to apply what they have learned as it relates to the "real world" and the resulting impact their learning has on their choices for the future.

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
Dobbs, Sarah	Principal	<p>As the instructional leader of the school, the principal will strive to guide the use of data-based decision making, progress monitor tiered groups of intervention, strategically plan differentiated professional development for all staff members via collaborative planning, allocate personnel/material resources strategically, conducts scheduled evaluative instructional/non-instructional observations (MCIES) and develops and maintains the Title I/District Budgets, Most importantly the principal will work toward building a strong school community where relationships are the foundation of the school culture as it relates to the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional success of all students (SAC/PTO; Crisis Management; and MDT) as well as facilitating grade-level collaborative meetings.</p>
Laplante, Allison	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision of how data-based decision-making impacts the implementation of high yield instructional strategies on Tier I instruction, monitoring student response to interventions/documentation (MTSS; PMP, PST), scheduling of support staff to assist with differentiated small group instruction. The Assistant Principal is also responsible for the scheduling and implementation of district/state assessments, as well as assisting in scheduled evaluative observations (MCIES). Maintains textbook/technology inventories, provides teachers with curriculum support and facilitates grade-level collaborative meetings.</p>
Wheeler, Scott	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision of how data-based decision-making impacts the implementation of high yield instructional strategies on Tier I instruction, monitoring student response to interventions/documentation (MTSS; PMP, PST), scheduling of support staff to assist with differentiated small group instruction. The Assistant Principal is also responsible for the scheduling and implementation of district/state assessments, as well as assisting in scheduled evaluative observations (MCIES). Maintains textbook/technology inventories, provides teachers with curriculum support and facilitates grade-level collaborative meetings.</p>
Mobley, Kimberly	Other	<p>The CAS assists the school and leadership team in providing a common vision of how data-based decision-making impacts the implementation of high yield instructional strategies on Tier I instruction, monitoring student response to interventions/documentation (MTSS; PMP, PST), scheduling of support staff to assist with differentiated small group instruction. Ms. Mobley will support coaching for new and veteran teachers and will implement MTSS monitoring with fidelity.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, Kristen	Dean	The dean assists the leadership team and school in providing a common vision of how data-based decision-making impacts the implementation of high yield instructional strategies on Tier I instruction, monitoring student response to interventions/documentation (MTSS; PMP, PST), and behavior management. The dean will support Tier 2 and 3 behavior monitoring as well as implementation of a school wide PBIS plan with school based expectations.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/12/2022, Sarah Dobbs

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.*

0

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

606

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

10

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

9

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	92	100	92	114	71	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	565
Attendance below 90 percent	61	54	55	58	41	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316
One or more suspensions	10	6	11	11	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in ELA	20	36	51	30	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
Course failure in Math	19	28	34	21	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	55	33	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	54	31	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	6	2	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	27	33	47	42	26	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200

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	4	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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 8/1/2022

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	87	100	102	101	89	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	44	65	50	56	55	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308
One or more suspensions	3	11	6	11	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	14	29	29	28	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Course failure in Math	16	34	23	21	22	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
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	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	10	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	40	32	35	25	31	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	1	4	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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	87	100	102	101	89	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	44	65	50	56	55	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308
One or more suspensions	3	11	6	11	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	14	29	29	28	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Course failure in Math	16	34	23	21	22	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
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	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	10	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	40	32	35	25	31	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	1	4	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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	29%	46%	56%				41%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	35%						50%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						39%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	27%	50%	50%				37%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	41%						44%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						33%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	25%	53%	59%				48%	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	36%	44%	-8%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	42%	45%	-3%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	43%	49%	-6%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	60%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	46%	44%	2%	53%	-7%
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	17	54	57	23	37	31					
HSP	33			50							
MUL	25			25							
WHT	30	34	44	27	40	56	23				
FRL	24	35	50	22	40	49	16				

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	25	27	13			10				
HSP	71			47							
WHT	35	50	41	30	27	5	38				
FRL	33	47	37	26	26	6	31				
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	11	27	14	18	41	33	16				
HSP	55	55		47	40						
MUL	45			60							
WHT	40	51	40	36	45	34	50				
FRL	36	47	42	32	40	35	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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	258
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	25
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 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	36
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Based on state assessment ELA data, 3rd-grade proficiency is overall trending downward, starting at 36% in 2019 and 32% in 2022. 4th grade is trending downward, starting at 45% in 2019 and 26% in 2022. 5th grade is trending downward, starting at 50% in 2018 and remaining at 46% in 2022. ELA Achievement is trending downward, starting at 42% in 2019 and 27% in 2022. 4th and 5th ELA Learning Gains decreased substantially in 2022; increased in 3rd grade in 2022 by 4% points. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile increased from 43% to 50% in 2022.

Based on FSA Math data, 3rd-grade proficiency is trending downward, starting at 43% in 2019 and dropping to 26% in 2022. 4th-grade proficiency is stagnant, starting at 35% in 2019 and staying at 36% in 2022.

5th-grade proficiency is trending downward, dropping from 33% in 2019 to 21% in 2022.

Math Achievement is trending downward, starting at 33% in 2019 and 21% in 2022. Math Learning Gains are trending downward as well, starting at 44% in 2019 to 41% in 2022. Math Lowest 25th Percentile has shown a substantial increase, starting at 5% to 51%. Based on the Statewide Science Assessment data, 5th-grade proficiency is trending downward, starting at 46% in 2019 and decreasing to 26% in 2022.

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

Based on FSA ELA data from 2019-2022 and supported by local progress monitoring data, we can note a grade level proficiency decline as follows: 3rd grade +4%, 4th grade -12%, and 5th grade -19%. We can also see a decline in 5th-grade math by -7% since 2019 and a decline of -9% in science.

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

Student attendance must increase in order for students to receive instruction. Guidance and social work assistant is monitoring attendance more frequently and being proactive in contacting families (no more than 3 absences). The Home School Liaison (HSL) will act as Tier 1 support for students identified on the EWS, the Social Work Assistant will support Tier 2 interventions. A student attendance recognition program will be enhanced to reward students with good or improved attendance.

In addition to these efforts, science scores are decreasing and may benefit from an increased focus on writing across the curriculum to include components in all academia. With an added focus on science and ELA instruction, the school-based Content Area Specialist (CAS) can coach for improvement.

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

Math Lowest Quartile increased substantially from 5% in 2021 to 51% in 2022. Math learning gains increased overall from 27% to 41%.

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

Scheduling of small group instruction was data-driven, groups were routinely adjusted, and student response to intervention was monitored. Grade levels worked together to deliver small group instruction (grades 3-5). An intervention teacher with a math focus was allocated through Title 1, allowing for an intentional math focus in 3-5.

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

Tier I Math/ELA instruction will be structured to provide students with hands-on learning experiences that are aligned to the depth of the standard while grade-level tasks are appropriate and meet the rigor and complexity of the standard to accelerate mastery of the content. Differentiated intervention in Math for all students K-5 to develop a strong base focused on foundational skills, and the Intervention teacher will facilitate intensive small group intervention for Tier 3 students. Implementation of Universal Design for Learning will address individual student needs and ability to access instruction. Each component must occur in small group instruction, during Tier 1 and small group, and during the scheduled intervention.

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.

During grade-level collaborative planning, data will be used to drive the professional development needs of grade-level teachers. A focus of collaborative planning will be improving Tier I instruction in ELA and Math K-5 using classroom data and local assessments. This planning will include an intentional focus on remediation during Tier 1. Coaches will facilitate grade-level collaborative planning twice weekly, assist with data analysis next steps, and provide coaching, co-teaching, and modeling as required. Teachers will be accountable for their student's data. The teacher must understand the standard and drill down to what are they doing, how are they teaching it, does it end with standard mastery, and the data aligned to such.

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

Continue professional development opportunities based on student data and teacher need that has been identified during grade-level collaborative planning. Interventions will have support facilitators collaboration, additional para-professional support will push in during small group instruction. To increase the effectiveness of Tier I teachers, we will implement and increase the use of transformation lessons and district-provided support and resources. A modified schedule will allow for monitoring of all core content academics by the leadership team and a focused intervention block.

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.

Based on the state (2019-2022) and local data, Science, ELA, and Math proficiency have been trending downward. It is imperative to ensure Tier I instruction meets the depth and rigor of the standard and that tasks are aligned and grade-level appropriate.

If teachers teach to the depth of the standard and use formative assessment to drive daily instructional decisions, then based on the 2023 data, the following increases in proficiencies will occur:

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA increase in proficiency:

3rd grade from 32 to 41%

4th grade from 26 to 41%

5th grade from 27 to 41%

Math increase in proficiency:

3rd grade from 26 to 41%

4th grade from 36 to 41%

5th grade from 21 to 41%

5th-grade science increase from 25% in 2022 to 41% in 2023

Monitoring:

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

Assessment and Progress Monitoring Data as well as district assessments. Data will be analyzed during grade level planning each week to assess needs for intervention or acceleration and ensure that instruction is aligned to the depth of the standard. Coaches will routinely monitor/assist with the implementation of instruction best practices. The administration will routinely conduct instructional walkthroughs and frequently monitor data for timely feedback and response.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Dobbs (sarah.dobbs@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Professional development to increase student engagement and deliberate use of formative assessment. Weekly collaborative planning will include data-based practices, which will increase the use of research-based strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Professional development on student achievement (.51 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) ensuring teachers understand and teach to the depth of the standard and formative evaluations (.90 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) teachers attending to what is happening for each student in their classroom as a result of their teaching. Teachers will respond to data and modify instruction based on outcomes.

**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.

Coaches will facilitate grade-level collaborative planning twice weekly, assist with data analysis next steps, and provide coaching, co-teaching, and modeling as required. Teachers will be accountable for their student's data. The teacher must understand the standard and drill down to what are they doing, how are they teaching it, does it end with standard mastery. This process will be guided by establishing instructional priorities to include instructional practices specifically related to standards-aligned instruction.

Person Responsible Kimberly Mobley (kimberly.mobley@marion.k12.fl.us)

To increase the effectiveness of Tier I instruction (K-5) in reading and math, student task alignment and learning activities will be created and delivered to the depths and complexity of the standard. Classrooms will be monitored to ensure that student work remains at the level needed to reflect student mastery of the standard. In addition, students will be provided exemplars to increase their understanding of the skills needed and the expectations for standards mastery.

Person Responsible Allison Laplante (allison.laplante@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

Based on the attendance data, EME has been experiencing an upward trend of K-5 students with less than 90% daily attendance (475 students with <90% instruction in 2022). Therefore there must be a concerted effort to monitor and intervene with those students to ensure that they are receiving the maximum number of instructional minutes that support students' academic success.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

If school stakeholders receive targeted professional development and ongoing support to implement social-emotional learning and restorative discipline practices, the number of K-5 students reporting attendance below 90% will decrease from 475 to 350. The leadership team will develop and implement a school-wide attendance plan with tiered support. This attendance plan will be supported by schoolwide expectations with incentives and community support.

Monitoring:

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

Daily student attendance reports (tardies, absences, early check-outs), Individualized attendance intervention plan, and Child Study Team Meetings (collaboration with Social Worker). Intentional support at various Tiers is presented by the HSL and SWA. The leadership team will develop and implement a school-wide attendance plan with tiered support. The team will use data to monitor and improve student attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Nieb (heather.nieb1@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

High expectations for students in reference to students' expectations for and belief in themselves. Targeted students will be assigned a mentor and staff member for check-in and communication with the family.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Development of high expectations for each student (1.44 effect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) involving students predicting and self-reporting. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to be involved in predicting their performance.

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.

Provide professional development for instructional/non-instructional staff focused on improving student attendance utilizing resources from Attendance Works and restorative practices. Emphasize school-wide attendance expectations (student and staff) and provide recognition opportunities weekly, monthly, and

quarterly. The HSL and the SWA will work closely with the counselor to implement a cohesive attendance incentive plan to support all learners and their family needs.

Person Responsible Stephanie Rivera (stephanie.rivera@marion.k12.fl.us)

School counselors will facilitate the successful implementation of the Caring School Community (SEL program) by providing them with professional development and the school-wide integration of monthly cultural

awareness throughout the school year. Counselors will monitor implementation and align observation with various data (attendance, BESS, EWS)

Person Responsible Heather Nieb (heather.nieb1@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

Phonics through UFLI

According to the Spring assessment of the Core Phonics Screener, East Marion students are performing, on average, 5% below the district average. With an average of 12% of students not on target in each grade level, a need for phonics intervention is needed. Teachers will be provided support in Phonics through UFLI, data will be discussed in collaborative planning, and will be monitored to gather progress measures. Teachers will be trained in new interventions for grades K-2 and will implement interventions daily. Fidelity will be tracked and measured, and data meetings will occur weekly.

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

Knowing that in grades 3-5, the ELA proficiency level is 29%, teachers will be trained in effective practices, which will include higher order questioning and student engagement, with a focus on Tier 1 instruction which implements literacy across the curriculum. Teachers will be trained in new interventions

for grades 3-5 and will implement interventions daily. Fidelity will be tracked and measured, and data meetings will occur weekly.

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 teachers implement the UFLI structures with fidelity, proficiency data should increase by 10% by mid-year. By the end of the year, the students in grades K-2 should show 50% proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

If teachers implement the engagement structures with fidelity, proficiency data should increase by 10% by mid-year. By the end of the year, the students in grades 3-5 should show 50% proficiency in District Progress Monitoring data.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Weekly data chats will take place on Tuesdays, led by CAS leads and administration. Teachers will learn how to assess their own data and create action plans. Students will also participate in data chats and will be able to set goals and monitor progress toward these goals. Parent conferences will include clear data and will be led by both student and teacher to better understand proficiency levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dobbs, Sarah, sarah.dobbs@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?

UFLI, and additional intervention (SIPPS, Heggerty, Lexi Core, Read 180) are research and evidence-based to improve proficiency and provide data for planning.

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?

Interventions will be led daily and selected as approved interventions based on the district-adopted plans. Collaborative planning efforts have been provided by and supported through the Bureau of School Improvement and will be supported by the district Transformation Department. Each of these efforts supports teacher progression to learning and understand the new BEST standards and establishes a system of monitoring.

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
<p>Literacy Leadership and Literacy Coaching will be implemented through a clearly established role and responsibility. The leadership team has narrowed a focus and established a lead in K-2 ELA and a CAS to support 3-5 ELA. Each of these persons will support ELA at their respective levels and implement coaching cycles as the administration sees fit. Data will be collected through established look fors and feedback will prompt growth.</p>	<p>Mobley, Kimberly, kimberly.mobley@marion.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Teachers will be trained in formative assessment and collection of such. Through a timeline of PD focus, the first 40 days of school will include a focus on gathering relevant assessment data to guide instruction and planning. Assessment and formative assessment will provide an opportunity for teachers to gather relevant and timely data. This effort will be supported by the entire leadership team.</p>	<p>Laplante, Allison, allison.laplante@marion.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Professional Learning and Collaborative planning- Teachers will complete various professional learning based on new interventions, formative assessments, and other related needs. Teachers will be provided weekly feedback each week to improve instruction.</p>	<p>Wheeler, Scott, scott.wheeler@marion.k12.fl.us</p>

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, volunteers, and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
 - Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
 - 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;
- Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys, and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys. School staff, families, and volunteers work together to promote a safe environment and positive school culture. School staff will promote a positive learning environment with the implementation of the Caring School Community SEL program and the implementation of our PBIS program. The school administrative staff along with a committee of staff volunteers, promotes a positive culture by recognizing both students

and staff throughout the year in order 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 to use at home to enhance their students' learning at home.

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

The key stakeholders for East Marion Elementary (EME) include the United Way of Marion County, which provides volunteers to mentor students and promotes literacy through their "Reading Pals" program. Our community business partner, American Dream Residential, provides monetary support, which provides funds for basic resources given to all our students. The Marion County Public Education Foundation provides social and instructional capital that directly impacts teachers, such as Tools for Teaching and grant opportunities. EME works closely with the Forest Library to promote literacy events that are open to the school community and our families. The Ocala Park and Recreation Department have supported EME by sponsoring community events that provide our families and students with school readiness resources. The goal of all EME stakeholders is to remove all barriers to learning and to provide built-in support for families in order to improve students' academic success and create a safe learning environment where students can grow and learn.