

Marion County Public Schools

Reddick Collier Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Reddick Collier Elementary School

4595 W HIGHWAY 316, Reddick, FL 32686

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to cultivate a safe learning environment that promotes responsibility, reflectiveness, engagement, confidence, and innovative thinking in our learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reddick-Collier Elementary will educate and meet the needs of all students so they will reach their full academic and personal potential and be prepared to be productive members in a global society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Manning, Donald	Principal	Oversee instructional and non-instructional personnel Budgets Evaluations Crisis Management; violence risk assessment Staff Development: Hiring, recruitment and retention SAC/PTO Fidelity Checks SIP MDT Crisis Team/Suicide/threat assess Title I Performance Matters/Data Dashboard Teacher Coaching Parent Intervention
Roberts, Tina	Assistant Principal	Scheduling Collaborative planning Evaluations Coaching and modeling MDT Clinic/MERT Lesson Plans SAC Fidelity Checks- PMP/MTSS Oversee Paras ESOL Designee Fidelity Checks- MTSS Assessment Coordinator Local and State Assessment Data Analysis
Jackson, Sandra	School Counselor	BESS Screener Support Mental Health counselor 504 Designee to facilitate student needs and intervention ESOL Designee and WIDA Support Small Group Counseling Social Worker Referrals Classroom walk through and support ESE/PMP/MTSS/PST Meetings; all paperwork CST and Attendance Conferences Attendance Data Analysis
Krietemeyer, Carol	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaching and Support Mentoring MTSS/PST Meetings Reading Intervention Support Professional Learning Support ELA Data Analysis

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sage, Michelle	Instructional Coach	New teacher support/ITD Instructional Coaching and Support MTSS/PMP Meetings Math Intervention Support Professional Learning Support Math and Science Data Analysis
Gentilman, Catherine	Dean	PBIS Support Behavior Intervention Support Safety Patrols Discipline Data Analysis MDT

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders including student, staff, families, and community members, are involved in surveys, local conversations, assessment data trends, and meetings that the school leadership team conducts to make decisions for school improvement. Input for these items allows the school leadership team to drive professional learning opportunities for staff and families to increase overall performance.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school improvement plan targets the areas needed to increase overall student performance. With new school initiatives in place for the 23-24 school year, the SIP will share the learning attributes and the processes that will take place campus-wide to increase the performance of instructional practices and student performance. Classroom visits and observations will take place weekly by the Principal and AP to ensure the desired learning outcomes.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%

2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: F
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	31	21	19	18	24	11	0	0	0	124	
One or more suspensions	0	1	6	7	23	12	0	0	0	49	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	6	19	13	10	0	0	0	48	
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	21	7	11	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	7	11	22	19	19	0	0	0	80	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	9	3	9	18	16	14	0	0	0	69	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	20	19	41	35	26	0	0	0	149	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	9	10	20	23	30	25	0	0	0	117

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	23	15	19	22	16	25	0	0	0	120	
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	15	3	15	0	0	0	47	
Course failure in ELA	15	20	20	23	3	19	0	0	0	100	
Course failure in Math	8	13	18	7	2	19	0	0	0	67	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	14	21	0	0	0	59	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	13	24	0	0	0	63	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	16	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	12	16	16	22	2	21	0	0	0	89

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	23	15	19	22	16	25	0	0	0	120	
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	15	3	15	0	0	0	47	
Course failure in ELA	15	20	20	23	3	19	0	0	0	100	
Course failure in Math	8	13	18	7	2	19	0	0	0	67	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	14	21	0	0	0	59	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	13	24	0	0	0	63	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	16	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	12	16	16	22	2	21	0	0	0	89

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33	44	53	35	46	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				59			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			73		
Math Achievement*	33	50	59	38	50	50	37		
Math Learning Gains				70			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			27		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	25	46	54	37	53	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					49	52			
Graduation Rate					41	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	43	57	59	69			32		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	172
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	4	4
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	20	Yes	1	1
HSP	43			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	32	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	3	3
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	33			33			25					43
SWD	19			26							3	
ELL	20			33							3	43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			19			13				4	
HSP	41			49							4	43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45			40			42				4	
FRL	32			32			28				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	35	59	50	38	70	67	37					69
SWD	4	32		18	58		8					
ELL	60	75		40	92							69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	48	43	27	76	74	21					
HSP	53	65		47	80		43					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44	78		56	63		60					
FRL	36	55	43	37	67	74	35					73

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	39	52	73	37	47	27	47					32
SWD	9	46		15	38	20						
ELL	39			30								32

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	56	70	21	30	25	20					
HSP	37	50		45	64		55					32
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	53		59	59		73					
FRL	34	49	75	33	43	25	44					27

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	49%	-11%	54%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	48%	-17%	58%	-27%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	39%	0%	50%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	53%	-20%	61%	-28%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	50%	-17%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	43%	-14%	51%	-22%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Statewide Science scores decreased by 12% in proficiency. The data indicates a decrease from 37% in 2021-22 to 25% in 2022-23. Contributing factors include a decrease in the use of hands-on science opportunities for engagement, the inconsistent implementation of the MCPS district science resources available, and a lack of science vocabulary instruction. This year a science lab has been added to increase student engagement as students will participate in the lab weekly.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Statewide Science scores showed the greatest decline from the 21-22 school year. The scores decreased for 37% to 25%. Contributing factors include a decrease in the use of hands-on science opportunities for engagement, the inconsistent implementation of the MCPS district science resources available, and the lack of vocabulary instruction.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Statewide Science showed the greatest gap when compared to state average. Reddick-Collier scored a 25% when the state average is a 51%. This result is 26% lower than the state average. There was a lack of pedagogy by instructor.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Both ELA and Math overall proficiency scores increased by 1% for grades 3-5. Grade 3 showed a 15% increase in ELA and a 16% increase in Math. The significant increase was due to structured weekly collaboration and data chats.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Thirty students in grade 4 in the 2022-23 school year showed two or more early warning indicators. This has prompted an action plan for additional supports to be placed in grade 5 to support students' needs. One support facilitator will be pulling small groups to increase performance with SWD. CAS's will be conducting side-by-side coaching with the teachers to increase student engagement.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Increase SWD proficiency by 18% in order to reach the 41% threshold.

Increase overall ELA proficiency by 5%.

Increase overall Math proficiency by 5%.

Increase science proficiency by 16%.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The School Culture and Climate Survey that students responded to revealed that only 4% of the participants feel that teachers can teach due to distracting behaviors within the classroom.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If students conduct themselves showing respect to peers, then the teacher will be able to teach all students more effectively.

Increase engagement in classroom through PBIS learner attributes. Teachers will model the expectations for students. Students will frequently reflect on their performance to ensure they are active participants in the learning process.

Increase student response rating from 4% of students feeling like teachers can teach to 70% of the students feeling like teachers can teach due to decreased behaviors.

Data collection of MDT referrals and Office Discipline Referrals will be analyzed to indicate if students increase engagement, then referrals will decrease.

Monitoring:

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

Frequent classroom visits to monitor the implementation of the Positive Behavior Intervention Support program during instruction as well as monitoring the use of the program in other areas of the campus such as sidewalks, special areas, cafeteria, and buses. The revision of the PBIS program has added incentives for positive behavior recognition school-wide. MDT referrals and Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catherine Gentilman (catherine.gentilman@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All faculty and staff are trained in the implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Support and are expected to follow the school-wide procedures with fidelity. If the teacher implements the program with fidelity, students will be engaged in academic content rather than making poor choices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The school has revised the PBIS programs to better meet the needs of all students. Teachers will model expectations for students and revisit rules and procedures often.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PBIS will be implemented throughout the school year. The Leadership team will monitor for teachers modeling positive behavior supports and recognize students and teachers who are implementing the program with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Catherine Gentilman (catherine.gentilman@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 11, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Small Group instruction with increased engagement by students in all content areas where the teacher or paraprofessional will deliver on-grade level content differentiated for the needs of the individual group. This includes SWD to support the increase from 24% to 41% in the federal index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If students are engaged in differentiated small group instruction, then students will be able to fill gaps related to on-grade level content resulting in success. This will support the expected increase in proficiency in grades 3-5 in the 2024 school year.

ELA increase in proficiency:

-3rd grade from 38% to 51%

-4th grade from 32% to 51%

-5th grade from 39% to 51%

Monitoring:

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

Teacher or para will track performance of individual students to provide needed supports to fill learning gaps during small group instruction. Leadership team will monitor student data and discuss next steps to increase student performance. Weekly walk-through feedback will be provided to the teacher to support instruction. Students in the bottom quartile will be assigned a member of the leadership to goal set and monitor student performance based on local and state assessment data including local benchmark assessments and F.A.S.T. assessments in grades 3-5 and S.T.A.R. assessments in grade K-2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tina Roberts (tina.roberts@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional learning to increase student engagement and deliberate use of formative assessment. Professional learning topics will include a focus on small group instruction, data analysis, technology best practices, and Resiliency. Twice Weekly collaborative planning will include data-based practices, which will increase the use of research-based strategies in planning and allow for monitoring through observation by administration after planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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. These modifications may include schedule changes, increased/decreased support through paras or other staff, and remediation or intervention plans.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 collaborate to conduct weekly classroom visits to ensure small group instruction is occurring within the classroom. Actionable feedback will be provided to the teachers for each visit. This feedback will include details of the small group lesson related to a specific benchmark.

Person Responsible: Tina Roberts (tina.roberts@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 11, 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Teachers will provide engagement opportunities across content areas through the use of hands-on tasks, collaborative conversations, and student application of learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If students are engaged in tasks related to instructional benchmarks, then the students will likely show proficiency in local and state assessments making a 5% gain in proficiency in grades 3-5.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will frequently visit classrooms weekly to ensure engagement opportunities are being planned and implemented effectively. Student input will be considered to determine their level of engagement. Teachers will receive feedback forms to increase performance in increasing engagement opportunities. For teachers who need additional supports based on the data collected will work collaboratively with the Content Area Specialist to identify and implement effective strategies to increase student engagement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donald Manning (donald.manning@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Actionable feedback will be provided in the moment to support the progress of student engagement opportunities in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The actionable feedback will support the in the moment practice of the teacher and the students to increase the engagement for all learners.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 monitor and provide actionable feedback related to engagement practices. Learning walks will take place for other teachers to witness engagement strategies of peers.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: October 1, 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Data chats are completed monthly with teachers and data is evaluated each week by the leadership team. This data guides planning for allocation through Title 1. Funding overview is reviewed through platforms such as faculty meetings, SAC meetings, and District/State discussion. The leadership team will meet 1x monthly with teachers to evaluate data and modify actions plans. Additionally, the school will communicate with district support and leadership to evaluate data, use of funds, instructional needs and modify action planning as needed.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

1 - 59% proficiency on STAR Reading PM3 - Focus on Tier 1 UFLI Foundations instruction to increase proficiency in reading.

2- 62% proficiency on STAR Reading PM3 - Focus on tier 1 UFLI Foundations instruction to increase proficiency in reading.

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

3 - 38% proficiency on FAST ELA PM3 - Focus on Tier 1 instruction to increase the depth and rigor of the instructional benchmark through grade level collaboration and task alignment.

4 - 32% proficiency on FAST ELA PM3 - Focus on Tier 1 instruction to increase the depth and rigor of the instructional benchmark through grade level collaboration and task alignment.

5 - 39% proficiency on FAST ELA PM3 - Focus on Tier 1 instruction to increase the depth and rigor of the instructional benchmark through grade level collaboration and task alignment.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

If the teachers teach to the depth of the benchmark and use formative assessment to drive daily instructional decisions, then based on the 2024 FAST PM3 data, the following increases in proficiency will occur...

ELA increase in proficiency:

- KG from 81% to 86% on STAR Early Literacy
- 1st grade from 59% to 64% on STAR Reading
- 2nd grade from 62% to 67% on STAR Reading

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If the teachers teach to the depth of the benchmark and use formative assessment to drive daily instructional decisions, then based on the 2024 FAST PM3 data the following increases in proficiency will occur...

ELA increase in proficiency:

- 3rd grade from 38% to 51%
- 4th grade from 32% to 51%
- 5th grade from 39% to 51%

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Assessment data, progress monitoring data, and local assessments will be monitored through weekly collaboration sessions with leadership team. Coaches will routinely monitor and assist with implementation of Tier 1 instructional practices. Administration will routinely conduct instruction walk-throughs. Actionable feedback will be given as needed.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Manning, Donald, donald.manning@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

Professional learning to increase student engagement and benchmark aligned learning tasks. Professional learning topics will focus on research based student engagement strategies and task alignment. Collaborative planning will be conducted twice per week which will increase the use of research based strategies and allow for monitoring through observation by administration.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Professional learning on student achievement (Hattie's Index of Teaching) ensuring teachers understand and teach to the depth of the benchmark including aligned learning task. Teachers will respond to data and make necessary instructional adjustments based on the data.

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
The coach will facilitate monthly literacy committee meetings that will analyze current trend data to determine professional learning needs and next steps. Coaching, Co-teaching, and modeling will be provided as needed. Teachers will be held accountable for student data.	Krietemeyer, Carol, carol.krietemeyer@marion.k12.fl.us
Professional learning will be determined based on current trend data from instructional walk-throughs by administration. Teacher leaders will provided timely professional learning and support to instructional staff.	Roberts, Tina, tina.roberts@marion.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Avenues of common communication include:

- School webpage (<https://www.marionschools.net/rce>)
- Information in monthly newsletter
- SAC Meetings
- PTO Meetings
- Referenced in weekly home call out and email
- Inclusion in grade level newsletters

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

7/11 - Parent/Teacher Mtg for Mission and Vision revision
 7/31 - Campus Revitalization Project
 8/8 - Meet the Teacher at RCE 10:00-11:30
 9/12 - Open House at RCE 5:00-7:00
 10/13 - Student-led Conference Night - 5:00-7:00
 10/27 - Safe Halloween 5:30-7:30
 11/16 - Reading Under the Stars 5:30-7:30
 2/9 - Science Exploration night 5:00-7:00
 3/8- F.A.S.T. Conference Night Grades 3-5 5:00-7:00
 Donuts with Dad
 Muffins with Mom

ELA and Math Literacy Breakfast

School webpage (<https://www.marionschools.net/rce>)

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Positive School Culture - The students and staff will participate in the Positive Behavior Intervention Support system every day. Faculty and staff will work with students to model positive behaviors and teach students the expectations needed to be successful.

Small Group Instruction - The leadership team will work collaboratively with teachers and paras in strengthening small group instruction based on the data that supports the small group. Grade level content will be addressed in small groups yet differentiated based upon individual student needs. Teachers and paras will work to fill academic gaps to support the mastery of the benchmarks. SWD will be a targeted group to progress monitor performance.

Student Engagement - Faculty and Staff will be trained to provide additional strategies to support student engagement. Hands-on activities and innovative strategies will increase student performance.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Through the implementation of the Positive Behavior Intervention Support system, students will be able to focus on academic achievement because of the increase in positive behaviors within the classroom. This program will be implemented in the small group settings and students will be recognized for their engagement throughout the instruction.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The MDT team will meet bi-weekly to identify and support the needs of individual students on campus. Depending on the severity of the individual student's needs, counseling may be provided by the school counselor, social worker, or the mental health counselor on the campus.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

All students at RCE will have the opportunity to participate in career day. Presenters from a variety of careers will speak to students of the importance of education and the significance of their careers.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

At RCE, we have implemented a progressive discipline model that allows students to correct behavior problems with the intention of learning from their mistakes. The model works in connection with the PBIS program to support positive discipline. Continuous behaviors of individual students may result in the student being referred to the MDT process for further supports.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

All professional learning will be derived from teacher needs for support. Teachers will have an option in what training they would benefit from in their individual practice. Collaborative planning is designed to review data and plan for the mastery of the next benchmark. Data chats are scheduled each month to review local and state assessment data and create an action plan.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

At RCE, we serve early childhood students in ESE PreK and in VPK. Students participate in ongoing progress monitoring by the teachers who reflect on students meeting the standards of their performance.