

Marion County Public Schools

Fessenden 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Fessenden Elementary School

4200 NW 89TH PL, Ocala, FL 34482

[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.

Through diverse experiences of purposeful instruction, learning, and family engagement designed for the whole child, students will have opportunities for successful outcomes in their educational careers and discover their own potential to achieve and prepare for their future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Fessenden Elementary School is to inspire and prepare students to actively engage in society through critical thinking and collaborative problem-solving skills; respecting core values of accountability, collaboration, compassion, high expectations, and integrity.

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
Newmones, Stacie	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and provide successful high-quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. Supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school and reports to the assigned administrator.
Ponder, Angela	Assistant Principal	To aid the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school. As a leadership partner, assist the principal in developing a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high-yield instructional strategies, the assessment of school staff, and monitoring the implementation of core, supplemental, and intervention resources used for instructional delivery and/or assessment purposes.
Shawley, Aimee	Dean	The Dean works collaboratively with administration and staff for the implementation of disciplinary policies and procedures to ensure a safe and orderly environment; works with students and parents, as needed, in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved discipline and promote academic success.
Stokes, Moneshia	Math Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of math and science, utilizing effective professional development practices to build the capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning.
Thomas, Janice	School Counselor	To coordinate a Comprehensive School Counseling Program for all students leading to academic success, career awareness, social/personal development, community involvement, and multicultural/global citizenship development.
Craig, Sandy	Reading Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the area of literacy, utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning.

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.

Through the sharing of school-wide data the school leadership team, teachers, support staff, parents (families), and community are given the opportunity to engage in collaborative conversations during School Advisory Council meetings, Family Engagement, and/or monthly data meetings based stakeholder roles in Fessenden's school community.

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))

Ongoing progress monitoring will take place throughout the school year during monthly data analysis meetings facilitated by our leadership team. Based on the collaborative discussions decisions will be made to continue moving forward with the current plan or revise based on identified needs.

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	71%
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	35	14	25	18	15	17	0	0	0	124	
One or more suspensions	10	5	16	10	29	11	0	0	0	81	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	8	12	16	2	8	3	0	0	0	49	
Course failure in Math	14	7	20	6	2	5	0	0	0	54	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	18	13	0	0	0	64	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	20	24	0	0	0	72	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	38	24	35	54	39	0	0	0	0	190	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	39	23	42	27	36	41	0	0	0	208

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	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	36	25	26	20	23	0	0	0	153	
One or more suspensions	10	15	5	11	14	24	0	0	0	79	
Course failure in ELA	36	34	34	20	7	4	0	0	0	135	
Course failure in Math	17	25	18	16	10	5	0	0	0	91	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	17	29	0	0	0	79	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	17	38	0	0	0	84	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	

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	23	30	21	20	11	10	0	0	0	115

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	36	25	26	20	23	0	0	0	153	
One or more suspensions	10	15	5	11	14	24	0	0	0	79	
Course failure in ELA	36	34	34	20	7	4	0	0	0	135	
Course failure in Math	17	25	18	16	10	5	0	0	0	91	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	17	29	0	0	0	79	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	17	38	0	0	0	84	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	

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	23	30	21	20	11	10	0	0	0	115

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	12
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*	37	44	53	38	46	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				50			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			54		
Math Achievement*	27	50	59	43	50	50	36		
Math Learning Gains				49			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			8		
Science Achievement*	36	46	54	17	53	59	34		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					49	52			
Graduation Rate					41	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	31	57	59	45			75		

** 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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	158
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
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	27	Yes	4	4
ELL	24	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	4	1
HSP	31	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	28	Yes	1	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	25	Yes	3	3
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	3	
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	43			

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	37			27			36					31
SWD	33			20							2	
ELL	15			15			50				5	31
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			16			11				4	
HSP	32			25			47				5	31
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49			44			64				4	
FRL	32			23			33				5	28

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	38	50	64	43	49	41	17					45
SWD	26	33		16	25							
ELL	30	42		39	48		17					45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	60	64	30	33	23	9					
HSP	37	47	50	47	59		21					45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	37	36		56	59		29					
FRL	32	50	72	37	48	42	14					50

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	53	54	36	38	8	34					75
SWD	13			25								
ELL	35	54		43	62		45					75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	47		27	37		21					
HSP	44	50		46	56		43					74
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46	71		38	23		42					
FRL	35	48	55	32	36		30					74

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	56%	49%	7%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	48%	-4%	58%	-14%
03	2023 - Spring	28%	39%	-11%	50%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	28%	48%	-20%	59%	-31%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	53%	-17%	61%	-25%
05	2023 - Spring	21%	50%	-29%	55%	-34%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	35%	43%	-8%	51%	-16%

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.

Our lowest performance was evident in math. Teachers' lack of understanding of mathematical concepts was identified by content areas specialists and a survey of needs from teachers. Low proficiency was reported in grades 3rd- 5th. 2023 FAST Math progress monitoring resulted in 4% proficiency for PM1; 10% proficiency for PM2, and 32% proficiency for PM3. As the year progressed, the collaborative planning structures made room for

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

The greatest decline was shown in Math. Student proficiency was reported at 43% for FSA in 2022, but declined to 29% in 2023 on the new FAST assessment. Factors contributing to this decline include: changes in administration, multiple changes in staff in grades 3rd - 5th due to vacancies being covered by paraprofessionals and substitutes throughout the year, inconsistent instruction due to multiple changes, and lack of conceptual knowledge of benchmarks based on survey of needs during collaborative planning.

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.

The Math data component shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Only 37% of 3rd - 5th grade students were proficient. The state reported 61% proficiency in 3rd-5th. Factors contributing to this decline include: changes in administration, multiple changes in staff in grades 3rd - 5th due to vacancies being covered by paraprofessionals and substitutes throughout the year, inconsistent instruction due to multiple changes, and lack of conceptual knowledge of benchmarks based on survey of needs during collaborative planning.

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

Our Math scores reported the greatest improvement. Throughout the year a reboot of our collaborative planning. Collaborative planning structures focused more on building the capacity of teachers to better understand the depth of the benchmark and planning purposeful lessons. The implementation of school-wide behavior expectations Math scores reported a decrease in non-proficient students; from 87% at PM1 to 44% at PM3.

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

Discipline/Behavior concerns play an important factor in our low proficiency. Many of our issues stem from multiple suspension throughout the year. Our discipline data reported over 523 processed referrals; many associated with disruptive behavior within class during instruction. K-2 students accounted for 203 (39%) of the total referrals.

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

To increase proficiency in Math and Reading prioritizing school-wide needs for greater success is vitally important. Our highest priorities are ranked as follows:

- Student Engagement
- Family Partnership
- Discipline/Behavior
- Professional Learning with follow-up

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 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.

ELA proficiency has trended below 45% for more than 3 years. ELA proficiency increased from 26% in 2018 to 38% in 2022 on FSA for 3rd -5th grade. Student achievement for the new state assessment, FAST, reported at 41% in 2023.

Collaborative planning will be used to enhance proficiency in ELA and Math by leveraging high-yield instructional strategies and professional learning for student engagement with the implementation of multitiered systems of instructional support.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If teachers instruct to the depth of the grade level benchmarks using high-yield instructional strategies for student engagement, Reading proficiency on the FAST Reading will increase from from 41% proficient on the 2023 PM3 assessment for grades 3rd-5th to 44% in 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring and assessment data will be used from school, district, and state levels. Monthly data analysis meetings will be held to monitor Tier 1 and MTSS progress as it relates to ELA. The ELA Content Area Specialist will routinely monitor the implementation of instruction as discussed weekly in collaboration and walkthroughs with administration; focusing on lesson delivery of instruction and student engagement using best practices. Walkthroughs will result in timely feedback and follow-up support based on needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@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.)

Collaborative planning inclusive of professional learning opportunities will be provided to support instructional planning and delivery; inclusive of student engagement structures and intentional planning for effective Tier 1 instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on Hattie's Index of Teaching, professional learning, or development (.51 Effect size), gives opportunity for teachers to better understand and teach to greater depth of standards using formative assessments or evaluative measure (.90 Effect size) to support next step for instruction.

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.

Collaborative planning teams will be formed and structured with norms and expectations.

Resource sharing will take place during scheduled collaborative planning and beyond.

Collaborative teams will share best practices within formed school-based teams; district and state support.

The continuous improvement model will be used to continually assess the impact of collaborative planning on student outcomes.

Professional learning will be included in collaborative planning based on walkthroughs from the Admin/CAS team and survey of needs.

Person Responsible: Sandy Craig (sandy.craig@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: These action steps will be monitored and adjustments made based on data reviews. This will be an ongoing process for continuous improvement throughout the year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

523 discipline referrals were reported during the 2022-2023 school year. Student responses to action learning probes resulted in students not knowing or understanding what engagement was. Climate surveys reported students felt the instruction was interrupted often by the misbehaviors of their peers; leading to inconsistent outcomes of student engagement from day to day. The focus will be to develop a resiliency program using district provided resources to foster a positive school climate and effectively address discipline issues.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If the capacity of teachers to use of instructional strategies is increased for student engagement, discipline referrals will decrease from 81 students, in grades K-5, at the end of the 2022-2023 school year to 60 or less by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will be done through monthly data meetings with leadership and school team leads. Continuous collaboration between students service manager, administration, discipline focus team. Continuous improvement model to determine goal growth and need for adjustments to meet goal

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacie Newmones (stacie.newmones@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.)

A strong start focus will be implemented using resiliency lessons, all teachers will engage in professional learning from Kagan to establish learner engagement structures, and ongoing support provided to staff from leadership; the district behavior team will support follow-up needs as the year progresses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on Hattie's Index of Teaching, professional learning, or development (.51 Effect size), gives opportunity for teachers to better understand and delivery effective resiliency lessons.

Teacher Clarity (.75 effect size) - ensuring teachers understand the value of building resiliency in their practice and the daily engagement practice of their students whether learning or socializing.

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.

Professional learning for all teachers (initial training and refresher) from Kagan and district support.
Monitoring through weekly walkthroughs and immediate feedback.
Safe environments for open dialogue will be created and monitored for consistency.
Monitor implementation of resiliency lessons provided from district.
Work closely with guidance counselor for supports needed.

Person Responsible: Aimee Shawley (aimee.shawley@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: These action steps will be monitored and adjustments made based on data reviews. This will be an ongoing process.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

Math Proficiency has trended below 45% for the last 3 years. Only 30% of 3rd-5th grade students scored an achievement level of 3 or higher on the FAST Math PM3 in 2023. Proficiency scores for all ESSA subgroups show the same trend or low proficiency; performing below 41%. Our focus will be on improving Math proficiency by implementing tailored instructional strategies that address the diverse needs of all students in 3rd - 5th; with a specific focus on all ESSA subgroups using diverse instructional strategies with deliberate practice for students

Measurable Outcome:

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

If all students receive tailored instructional strategies and differentiated instruction through multi-tiered systems of support FAST Math proficiency in grades 3rd - 5th will increase from 30% in 2023 to 35% in 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Consistent data analysis will be implemented during weekly collaborative planning meetings. State assessment and progress monitoring data will be analyzed as well as district assessments. Teachers will identify needs for remediation, intervention, and acceleration to ensure students receive timely support for their specific instructional needs. The Math Content Area Specialist will routinely monitor and/or assist with the implementation of instructional strategies. Administration will routinely conduct classroom walkthroughs, provide feedback, follow up for continuous improvement, and monitor data with the Math CAS for next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacie Newmones (stacie.newmones@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.)

In order to increase student success, we will increase our use of explicit instruction setting an expectation of maximizing instructional time with effective strategies for deliberate practice.

Teachers will meet once a week to discuss benchmark-driven instruction for Math.

The Math CAS will demonstrate instructional strategies, model the use of manipulatives, and incorporate the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards.

The Math CAS will collaboratively plan specific strategies for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Teachers will be provided resources to support students and students will consistent intervention instruction.

Teachers will monitor students using research-based resources and make data-driven decisions as needed.

The Math CAS will work closely with teachers to incorporate differentiated small-group instruction to meet the needs of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaboration, modeling, and resource sharing will be used whereas this supports the goal of deliberate practice. (Hattie's index for visible learning effect size of 0.79)

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.

Include demonstration of the CRA (Concrete, Representation, and Abstract) model for each benchmark prior to instruction during collaboration.

Use FAST Progress Monitoring data, district assessment data, and formative assessments to plan small group instruction and differentiation opportunities.

Classroom walkthroughs conducted regularly and timely feedback provided

Identify Tier 2 and 3 students and monitor regularly through data analysis during collaborative meetings or scheduled data meetings.

Person Responsible: Moneshia Stokes (moneshia.stokes@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: These action steps will be monitored and adjustments made based on data reviews. This will be an ongoing process for continuous improvement throughout the year.

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)).

Reviewing school improvement funding allocations based on needs will include:

- gathering data to support continuous improvement
- setting clear goals
- prioritizing needs
- considering equity needs/challenges and building an action plan if needed
- communicating with stakeholders regularly
- monitor progress
- purposefully allocate funds with ongoing monitoring

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

Reading scores on STAR Early Literacy for PM3 resulted in 32% of Kindergarten students at or above grade level proficiency.

Reading scores on STAR Reading for PM3 resulted as follows:

1st Grade – 50% at/above grade-level proficiency

2nd Grade – 32% at/above grade-level proficiency

Teachers will receive continuous support in Phonics UFLI through mini professional learning and modeling during collaboration with additional opportunities upon request. Data will be discussed and progress monitored during collaborative planning. Teachers will receive differentiated professional learning throughout the year based on classroom walkthrough, observational feedback from administration, and teacher requests. Fidelity will be checked and monitored weekly.

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

ELA Proficiency has trended 45% and below since 2017. Only 41% of 3-5th grade students scored 3 or higher on the FAST Reading in 2023.

3rd - 28%

4th - 45%

5th - 54%

Teachers will receive continuous professional learning for effective learning structures and student engagement. With a focus on Tier 1 instructions, teachers will engage in weekly collaborative planning to ensure instructional tasks are aligned, conceptual analysis of benchmarks are clear, create whole and small group instructional plans, and share best practices for instructional delivery, student engagement, and successful outcomes.

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 we provide all instructional staff Tier 1 reading instruction with an emphasis on small group instruction targeting fluency, phonics, and strategies for students learning to reading, then our overall ELA proficiency will increase by 3% in each grade level on STAR PM3 for 2024.

Kindergarten would increase from 32% - 35% at or above grade level on STAR Early Literacy.

First Grade would increase from 50% - 53% at or above grade level on STAR Reading.

Second Grade would increase from 32% - 35% at or above grade level on STAR Reading.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If we provide all students in grades 3rd -5th with effective Tier 1 reading instruction with an emphasis on flexible, small groups and targeted instruction, then our overall ELA proficiency will increase by 3% in each grade level on FAST Reading PM3 for 2024.

3rd Grade would increase from 28% to 31% at or above grade level.

4th Grade would increase from 45% to 48% at or above grade level.

5th Grade would increase from 54% to 57% at or above grade level.

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.

Weekly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data (such as IXL, F.A.S.T, STAR Early Literacy, Star Reading, UFLI, MTSS data, etc.), will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will participate in data analysis discussions with the leadership team after each FAST progress monitoring, as well as district assessments, for continuous improvement plans to be developed and instructional planning to support created goals. The CAS will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and check for understanding.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Newmones, Stacie, stacie.newmones@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?

Weekly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data (such as IXL, F.A.S.T, STAR Early Literacy, Star Reading, UFLI, MTSS data, etc.), will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. The implementation of programs such as UFLI, SIPPS, IXL, READ 180, and SAVVAS would be used for the improvement of student outcomes.

Students will be monitored for instructional needs and flexible grouping will occur for remedial, on-level, and acceleration support.

Teachers will participate in data analysis discussions with the leadership team after each FAST progress monitoring, as well as district assessments, for continuous improvement plans to be developed and instructional planning to support created goals. The CAS will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and check for understanding.

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?

According to Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategies, RTI (Response to Intervention – Effect size = 1.07) is one of the top influences on students’ academic success. Included in RTI are components such as universal screening, quality core instruction, progress monitoring; supplemental and intensive intervention. How we respond to the needs of students based on collected data should be strategic and purposeful for successful outcomes.

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
Teachers will engage in weekly collaborative planning inclusive of data analysis and professional learning for continuous improvement.	Craig, Sandy , sandy.craig@marion.k12.fl.us
Flexible small groups will be formed to support the identified needs of students and data folders will be created to build the capacity of students' ownership of their learning.	Newmones, Stacie, stacie.newmones@marion.k12.fl.us
Paraprofessionals will receive professional learning to support small group needs.	Ponder, Angela, angela.ponder@marion.k12.fl.us
Weekly walkthroughs will be done to monitor the fidelity of direct instruction and management of computer-based supports in use to determine professional learning needs and provide timely feedback for student success.	Newmones, Stacie, stacie.newmones@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.

The information from the SIP will be shared as follows:

Open House - PowerPoint created into video for sharing and accessing at later dates

School Advisory Council Initial Meeting and follow up as needed

PTO Meetings Initial Meeting and follow up as needed

Published on school webpage

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))

Family engagement activities have been planned throughout the year to build home-school partnerships
Family Engagement Liaison will work closely with leadership team to create purposeful events and opportunities for family/community connections and engagement

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)

Consistent collaborative planning with ongoing data analysis will be established and monitored to support a continuous improvement model for greater student achievement; increasing the quality of student engagement for student success.

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))

N/A

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 implementation of Caring School Community will take place to ensure supports are in place to improve student skills beyond academics.

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))

Family Engagement Liaison will serve as a connection between local businesses and workforce agency to bring awareness to students and families of opportunities beyond elementary and secondary school years.

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).

Tier 1 school-wide behavior expectations have been created as a shared vision and implemented. Ongoing supports of professional learning, follow up supports for teachers, and ongoing practice with students are planned throughout the school year.

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))

Weekly Collaborative planning and differentiated professional learning has been planned and scheduled to support staff for the improvement of instruction. Data collection and analysis will be used for continuous improvement.

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))

Our VPK units support incoming 4 years old students and parents with preparing and transitioning into the elementary program. MCPS Early Learning leads support school base efforts by providing continuous professional learning and follow-up.