

Marion County Public Schools

Ward Highlands 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	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Ward Highlands Elementary School

537 SE 36TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[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.

Ward-Highlands Elementary School seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success through developmentally appropriate instruction that allows for individual differences and learning styles. Our school promotes a safe, orderly, caring, and supportive environment. Each student's self-esteem is fostered by positive relationships with students and staff. We strive to have our parents, teachers, and community members actively involved in our students' learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ward-Highlands Elementary School is a place where all students can learn; academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere. Teachers and staff work tirelessly to promote a positive school environment and raise student performance. Our goal is to work in a partnership with our parents and community to create an environment where students are empowered to discover their strengths and to achieve their maximum potential. Our entire school community shares the belief that all children can and will learn.

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
Buck, Treasa	Principal	Treasa Buck is the instructional leader for Ward-Highlands Elementary. She works with all stakeholders to provide a successful learning environment for all students. Mrs. Buck provides resources to all stakeholders in order to improve success for all students.
Miller, Karly	Math Coach	Karly Miller focuses on math and science within all grade levels. She models instruction and provides professional development in the areas of math and science. Based on data, Mrs. Miller will provide additional support to teachers and paras in order for students to be successful.
Walden, Jessica	Reading Coach	Jessica Walden focuses on reading and writing within all grade levels. She models instruction and provides professional development in the areas of reading and writing. Based on data Mrs. Walden will provide additional support to teachers and paras in order for students to be successful.
Roberts, Steven	Dean	Steven Roberts focuses on developing a positive school culture through modeling expectations across the campus. He works with students who need additional support in the area of behavior within our general education population as well as our self-contained population. Mr. Roberts provides monthly professional development to the staff on classroom engagement and management.
Byard, James	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for providing teachers with the resources needed to instruct students. The assistant principal works with the guidance department and ESE department to monitor data and create individual learning plans for students not being successful.
McCamley, Amie	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for providing teachers with the resources needed to instruct students. The assistant principal works with the guidance department and ESE department to monitor data and create individual learning plans for students not being successful.

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.

Data collected at the end of the school year is reviewed with the leadership team, School Advisory Council, and staff members to develop new goals for the upcoming school year. Our School Advisory Council consists of teachers, paraprofessionals, families, business partner, and local churches. Our SIP goals are reviewed at each SAC meeting.

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 SIP will be monitored during each quarterly School Advisory Council meeting. The committee will review data related to our SIP goals and adjust support as needed. The schools leadership team will review the SIP goals at each data meeting. Data meetings occur after each district and state assessment. Adjustments will be made based on the data review.

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	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	98%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	40	47	34	52	31	33	0	0	0	237	
One or more suspensions	10	6	10	8	15	10	0	0	0	59	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	31	25	3	0	0	0	59	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	32	25	3	0	0	0	60	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	49	38	19	0	0	0	106	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	34	25	19	0	0	0	78	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	11	

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	37	26	57	61	44	47	0	0	0	272

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	2	21	1	0	0	0	0	24
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	62	41	44	44	33	35	0	0	0	259	
One or more suspensions	6	6	11	15	20	0	0	0	0	58	
Course failure in ELA	17	35	55	28	7	9	0	0	0	151	
Course failure in Math	17	23	39	20	9	6	0	0	0	114	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	51	18	30	0	0	0	99	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	19	34	0	0	0	94	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	11	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	20	28	47	25	11	16	0	0	0	147

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	2	24	1	0	0	0	0	29
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	62	41	44	44	33	35	0	0	0	259	
One or more suspensions	6	6	11	15	20	0	0	0	0	58	
Course failure in ELA	17	35	55	28	7	9	0	0	0	151	
Course failure in Math	17	23	39	20	9	6	0	0	0	114	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	51	18	30	0	0	0	99	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	19	34	0	0	0	94	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	11	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	20	28	47	25	11	16	0	0	0	147

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	2	24	1	0	0	0	0	29
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*	54	44	53	55	46	56	57		
ELA Learning Gains				63			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			39		
Math Achievement*	71	50	59	65	50	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				71			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			38		
Science Achievement*	62	46	54	54	53	59	45		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					49	52			
Graduation Rate					41	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	57	59	43			59		

** 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	57			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	51			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	57			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	52			

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	54			71			62					64
SWD	22			40			50				4	
ELL	58			74							4	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			44			46				4	
HSP	54			68			48				5	70
MUL	35			65							2	
PAC												
WHT	63			82			74				4	
FRL	43			63			51				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	55	63	46	65	71	52	54					43
SWD	26	38	26	34	54	41	28					
ELL	50	92		50	50							43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	63	58	46	56	41	32					
HSP	48	70	79	55	60	50	48					46
MUL	52	60		52	73							
PAC												
WHT	64	60	23	75	78	60	59					
FRL	46	61	46	57	68	50	45					45

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	57	60	39	63	54	38	45					59
SWD	27	42	33	38	48	42	21					
ELL	35			41								59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	45	36	39	47		25					
HSP	52	53		64	59		44					63
MUL	44			28								
PAC												
WHT	66	65	42	70	58	47	53					
FRL	47	52	31	52	48	31	35					50

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	65%	49%	16%	54%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	50%	39%	11%	50%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	48%	17%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	53%	19%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	50%	22%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	43%	18%	51%	10%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our fourth grade ELA FAST PM3 results. This was compared to the MCPS district and state results. The growth from PM1 to PM3 in this same area had the least amount of increase compared to third grade and fifth grade. The prior year's data from this cohort in third grade also showed the lowest performance.

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

All data components showed growth from the previous school year.

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.

When comparing our data to the state data fourth grade ELA performed 12% below the state on PM3. Ward Highlands did grow from PM1 to PM3 in fourth grade ELA but not at the same rate as the state. Attendance data shows that our fourth grade students missed a larger percentage of school than other grade levels.

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

The most improvement shown when comparing PM1 to PM3 was our Math data in grades 3-5. When reviewing PM1 data we noticed that students struggled answering math equations on the computer. Teachers added additional practice working math equations on the computer based on current benchmarks.

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

Attendance with students missing 10% or more of instruction is a concern.

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

1. Attendance
2. ELA proficiency in third grade
3. ELA proficiency in fifth grade
4. Writing instruction in fourth and fifth grade.

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 Other**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.

An area of focus for creating a positive culture and environment is increasing student daily attendance. For the 22/23 school year our daily rate of attendance was 91%. Creating a positive culture for our students will increase attendance among our chronically absent students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If Ward Highlands implements a whole-school Positive Behavior Support plan that includes a focus on attendance then the daily rate of attendance will increase from 91% to 94% by the end of the 23/24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The Home School Liaison at Ward Highlands will monitor the attendance of our chronically absent students daily. The guidance department will run an attendance report biweekly and report to the leadership team the schools daily rate of attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@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.)

Positive reinforcement provided by our guidance counselors to students who are listed as chronically absent will take place every 5 days the student attends school. Students will receive a weekly check in by the guidance department or the Home School Liaison.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In elementary our students have very little control of their attendance. By providing positive reinforcement when the students attend school will encourage students to want to attend school which will encourage parents to follow through with ensuring their child is in school.

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.

Weekly reports and check ins with our chronically absent students.

Person Responsible: Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning the week of August 28th and occurring weekly.

Guidance counselors will run an attendance report biweekly and share with the leadership team.

Person Responsible: Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning the week of August 28th, biweekly

Students will be identified that will be provided an attendance goal and positive reinforcement when they attend school.

Person Responsible: Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: The week of August 28th.

#2. 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.

According to the PM3 FAST ELA data from the 22/23 school year our ELA proficiency in 4th grade was below the state and district. According to the PM1 ELA comparison to the PM3 ELA in 2nd grade the percentage of growth was below 4 of the other grade levels. This will require our focus to be on 3rd grade and 5th grade proficiency .

Measurable Outcome:

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

If Ward Highlands monitors district and state assessments and uses the data to plan meaningful instruction aligned to the grade level benchmarks and provide small group instruction then the 3rd grade proficiency will increase from 50% to 55% and our 5th grade proficiency from 46% to 51% on the FAST ELA PM 3 for the 23/24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students in grades 3rd-5th will be monitored using district and state assessments. Students in kindergarten- 2nd will be monitored using state assessments. After each district or state assessment in all grade levels teachers and administration will review all data components by grade level, class, and individual student. This data will be used to create goals for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@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.)

The MTSS process will be used to determine individual student needs in ELA. Students will receive intervention for 30 minutes 4-5 days per week focused on reading. Teachers will use small group instruction 3-5 days per week in the area of reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing students with small group instruction focused on their specific need will strengthen their reading skills. Using the MTSS process we can provide more consistent direct interventions based on the student need in the area of reading.

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.

The leadership team along with instructional teachers will identify interventions for each student based on current data and past performance. Students will be grouped accordingly and provided intervention daily.

Instructional teachers with the support of our academic coaches and administration will create and implement effective small group lessons and activities aligned with current benchmarks. During weekly collaborative planning sessions small group instruction will be planned for each core subject.

Person Responsible: Jessica Walden (jessica.walden@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: MTSS will begin August 28th and continue for the school year. Collaborative planning will begin August 21st and continue for the school year.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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 percentage of proficiency among Ward-Highlands' students with disabilities has decreased from the 2021 school year to the 2023 school year. The Students with Disabilities subgroup is currently below 41% according to the Department of Education.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we focus on tier 3 instruction for our students with disabilities in the area of reading proficiency then our students with disabilities will score above 41% proficiency according to the FAST AP 3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and administration will monitor the progress of our students with disability using the FAST progress monitoring assessment given three times during the school year and using district progress monitoring assessment given three times during the school year. This data will drive planning during collaborative planning sessions and tier 1 & 2 instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Walden (jessica.walden@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.)

Students with disabilities will be provided with small group instruction facilitated by their teacher and support staff. In addition to small group instruction the students will engage in a Multi Tiered System of Support using interventions chosen using progress monitoring data that correlates with their individual need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FSA trend shows there is a need for a focus on students in the SWD subgroup. Students in the EBD self contained units have limited access to instruction in the general education classrooms due to their specialized needs. Allowing for students to learn in small groups with the inclusion teacher, the general education teacher, and the ESE paraprofessional will allow for individual needs to be met. Staff will be able to provide standards based instruction differentiated by student need and provide immediate support to struggling students.

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.

Students in the Varying Exceptionality self-contained classroom will be placed in general education inclusion classrooms for all subjects. These students will be provided intensive support by an ESE inclusion teacher and a general education inclusion teacher.

Person Responsible: Jessica Walden (jessica.walden@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Students that meet the criteria will be moved in one or more subjects by October 5, 2023.

Teachers in our Emotional Behavior Disability classrooms will participate in collaborative planning with academic coaches, inclusion teachers, and administration weekly to develop individualized lesson plans for each student based on progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible: Jessica Walden (jessica.walden@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Meetings will begin the week of September 5, 2023.

An inclusion teacher and an ESE paraprofessional will focus on students in the bottom quartile for learning gains according to the most recent FSA data. They will provide small group and individualized instruction within the general education classroom.

Person Responsible: Jessica Walden (jessica.walden@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: This support will begin the week of September 5, 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).

ATSI- Students With Disabilities

Throughout the school year the leadership team and School Advisory Council will monitor data and review resources being used with our students with disabilities. This includes programs and people being used as additional support in the areas of reading and math. Training of our staff members that work with students with disabilities will be provided based on new purchases using school improvement funds.

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

N/A

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

According to progress monitoring and data from the 2023 FAST assessment, Ward-Highlands has a need for improvement in third and fourth grade reading proficiency. Students in grade 3 scored a 43% proficiency in ELA on the 2022 FSA assessment. The percent of proficient students in grades 3-5 was 57% on the 2023 FAST assessment. Individual grade level proficiency was 3rd grade at 54%, 4th grade at 50%, and 5th grade at 67% for ELA on the 2023 FAST assessment. The area of focus will be on phonics instruction and comprehension. The school will identify students needing intervention in both areas and provide students with evidence based programs facilitated by highly effective/reading endorsed teachers.

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Ward Highlands earned a 50% proficiency on the 4th grade FAST assessment for the 22/223 school year. For the 23/24 school year Ward Highlands will earn a 53% proficiency based on the FAST state assessment taken in May of 2024.

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.

Administration will monitor individual student data from District Benchmark assessments, FAST assessments, and weekly/biweekly benchmark assessments. The data collected will drive action plans for individual students and teachers ongoing throughout the 23/24 school year.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Buck, Treasa, treasa.buck@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?

During the 23/24 school year the staff will focus on understanding and implementing the instructional framework. There will be a focus on the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan Achieve 2026 Goal #1: Student Success. Our weekly collaborative planning will have teachers working together to strengthen tier 1 instruction.

During the 23/24 school year teachers will work together in collaborative planning to plan using progress monitoring assessments, curriculum maps, and subject area core curriculum. The districts core curriculum aligns to the BEST ELA Standards. Teachers will identify individual student need and use resources that will foster individual student needs.

Students will be provided with small group/individual instruction based on their area of need identified by the FAST assessments and Benchmark assessments.

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?

Based on FAST AP 3 data from the 22/23 school year and current FAST data students with disabilities will be placed in interventions that will target their area of need. Interventions include SIPPS, Read 180, UFLI, Read Naturally Live and My Focus. Since the focus will be on phonics and comprehension the chosen interventions will target both areas. Small group instruction allows for scaffolding which has an effect size of .82 on Hattie’s Effect Sizes related to student achievement.

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, Academic Coaches, and administrators will identify students needing additional support using 22/23 FAST AP3 data and current FAST Data in all grade levels. Students will be placed in groups based on the identified need for MTSS and classroom small group instruction.	Buck, Treasa, treasa.buck@marion.k12.fl.us
Administration and Academic Coaches will monitor data from FAST assessments, District Benchmark assessments, and Benchmark assessments. Students that are not being successful will be identified and action plans will be created for teachers and support personnel. This will be ongoing throughout the school year.	Byard, James, james.byard@marion.k12.fl.us
Academic Coaches will train highly effective/reading endorsed teachers to provide interventions based on student need. During collaborative planning teachers will work on strategic planning using up to date data and plan for small group instruction.	Walden, Jessica, jessica.walden@marion.k12.fl.us
Teachers will use our new progress monitoring data to plan for individual students using previous and new supplemental resources along with their core curriculum.	Buck, Treasa, treasa.buck@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.

Once the SIP is approved members of the SAC and members of PTO will receive an electronic copy by email. At each SAC meeting we will review our goals and the data to monitor our progress to meeting those goals. The school will print a copy of our mission, vision, and goals and send home with each student. The entire plan will be uploaded to our website at <https://www.marionschools.net/whe>.

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))

Ward-Highlands Elementary School adopted the Soft Skills initiative as their schoolwide expectations. The expectations include the following 5 traits: Team Player, Dependable and Reliable, Great Work Ethic, Positive Attitude, and being a Good Communicator. These five Soft Skill expectations are embedded in all areas of the school environment and is expected to be shown through their academics

and behavior. There is a staff piece to our Soft Skill initiative that allows staff members to praise other staff members for showing those same traits. The student and staff Soft Skill Superhero awards are announced on the morning to congratulate the recipients and to encourage others to exhibit those same traits.

The dean at Ward-Highlands facilitates and monitors the effectiveness of the program. She collects the data, provides strategies to classroom teachers on how to highlight a specific trait, and speaks about the positive impact on the school when everyone works hard to exhibit the Soft Skill expectations. Members of the leadership team make positive phone calls home to students who receive a Positive Referral that highlights one of the five traits.

Involving families and the community in the school's culture is crucial to maintaining a positive learning environment for students. It is important that all members of the school are recognized for their efforts and encouraged to continue their great work. Ward- Highlands has two local churches that provide support through school supply donations for students and teachers, providing monthly snack baskets for the staff, and participating in a yearly school beatification event. The leadership team makes positive phone calls home when a student earns a Soft Skills Superhero award and that creates a positive bond between the school and home. All stakeholders are invited to join the Ward-Highlands School Advisory Committee and the Parent Teacher Organization. The Family Engagement Plan can be found at <https://www.marionschools.net/whe>.

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)

The master schedule is created maximizing the instructional time by limiting transition time and time spent on non instructional duties. This increases the amount of time students spend engaging in academic instruction. All students will participate in MTSS for 30 minutes daily receiving intervention or enrichment based on their need. Teachers meet twice a week to collaboratively plan in ELA and Math. Teachers will meet 1-2 times per month to collaboratively plan for writing and science. In grades 3rd-5th teachers specialize in core subjects and work in a team to support students.

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))

na