

Marion County Public Schools

Sparr 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Sparr Elementary School

2525 E HWY 329, Anthony, FL 32617

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to foster relationships with all stakeholders to remove barriers to student success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a nurturing learning community, committed to preparing young minds to be academically and socially competitive for college and career readiness.

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
Johnson, Renee	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader by overseeing all academic initiatives for Sparr. She supports instruction by facilitating collaboration and being present during classroom instruction. Furthermore, she provides consistent, quality learning opportunities for staff in an effort to enhance instructional practices and optimize resources. These efforts will in turn yield optimum learning opportunities for learners resulting in improved academic success for students.
Borge-Shaffer, Deborah	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal provides support for the vision and leadership of the principal by supporting Tier 1 instruction and learning opportunities. The assistant principal supports the collaborative process and follows through by seeing it through to impact during instruction. She provides coaching and learning opportunities for staff which yield enhanced instructional and learning opportunities.
Schrader, Sarah	Reading Coach	The instructional coach supports the staff and administration by serving as a content area expert. She supports instruction via co-teaching and coaching opportunities. Furthermore, she supports collaboration by serving as a content area expert and provides feedback and guidance in the development of high quality, Tier 1 instruction.
Urso, Dolores	Dean	The student services manager supports the overall academic goals of the school by providing organizational and behavioral management. She provides discipline support and serves as classroom management coach.
Grubbs, Eva	School Counselor	The guidance counselor supports the mental health needs of students. She also supports behavioral and academic interventions.

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.

During the end of previous school year, student achievement data and survey results were shared with the faculty and with various stakeholders/community members (staff members, families, business partner) for the purpose of input on School Improvement goals for the upcoming year. It was agreed that the primary focus would be ELA proficiency.

SIP Monitoring

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

The School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored via frequent and consistent data analysis meetings. Every week, each leadership team member is tasked with pulling specific data to review at the weekly leadership meetings. Data will include class averages, grade level averages of all ELA and Math Benchmark Assessments and District Progress Monitoring Assessment and state Progress Monitoring Assessments. Specific students will be identified early in the school year for the purpose of monitoring their progress to ensure adequate improvement. These students will be provided individual support based on need. These support plans will be consistently revised as needed.

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	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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: C 2018-19: C 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	17	19	14	16	16	7	0	0	0	89	
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	4	7	9	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	8	14	25	32	15	16	0	0	0	110	
Course failure in Math	9	12	20	21	14	11	0	0	0	87	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	22	19	0	0	0	80	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	15	19	0	0	0	60	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	15	27	43	40	47	0	0	0	182	

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	8	10	19	32	12	15	0	0	0	96

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	25	24	25	25	23	26	0	0	0	148	
One or more suspensions	6	15	13	18	16	22	0	0	0	90	
Course failure in ELA	11	13	29	16	6	18	0	0	0	93	
Course failure in Math	14	10	34	18	6	18	0	0	0	100	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	23	25	0	0	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	17	28	0	0	0	66	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	29	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	12	17	30	24	10	24	0	0	0	117

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	25	24	25	25	23	26	0	0	0	148	
One or more suspensions	6	15	13	18	16	22	0	0	0	90	
Course failure in ELA	11	13	29	16	6	18	0	0	0	93	
Course failure in Math	14	10	34	18	6	18	0	0	0	100	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	23	25	0	0	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	17	28	0	0	0	66	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	5	19	0	0	0	0	0	29	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	12	17	30	24	10	24	0	0	0	117

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	38	44	53	40	46	56	42		
ELA Learning Gains				60			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69			64		
Math Achievement*	57	50	59	52	50	50	46		
Math Learning Gains				68			69		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			70		
Science Achievement*	41	46	54	45	53	59	44		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					49	52			
Graduation Rate					41	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		57	59	73					

** 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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	169
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	14	Yes	2	1
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	47			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	46			

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%
FRL	38	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	1	
ELL	73			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	61			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	57			

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	38			57			41					
SWD	7			26							3	
ELL	20			50							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20			48			36				4	
HSP	41			69			30				3	
MUL	40			71							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	45			57			48				4	
FRL	31			53			41				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	40	60	69	52	68	67	45					73
SWD	11	48	69	21	50	45	6					
ELL												73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	50	60	39	73	64	17					
HSP	48	64		52	71							70
MUL	29	71		47	64							
PAC												
WHT	45	61		59	65		56					
FRL	35	60	76	46	68	68	43					

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	42	59	64	46	69	70	44					
SWD	10	50		7	50							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	30		22	60		20					
HSP	30	55		35	55							
MUL	33			25								
PAC												
WHT	57	78		69	94		69					
FRL	40	58	60	41	68		36					

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	47%	49%	-2%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	58%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	39%	-8%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	53%	16%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	43%	-3%	51%	-11%

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.

At 42% proficient, the data component which showed the lowest performance is ELA proficiency among all students. While the ELA proficiency has gradually improved over the recent years, this area continues to be the area in which Sparr students are experiencing the lowest performance.

Contributing factors include the lack of qualified teachers as well as the lack of appropriately aligned instruction, curriculum, and resources.

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

The data component that showed the largest decline was 3rd grade reading, at 32% proficient. Factors that contribute to this decline include a lower proficiency rate for the incoming cohort than the year prior, the lack of appropriately aligned instructional resources, and novice teachers who lack experience with the content and benchmarks.

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 data component that had the greatest gap with compared to the state average is 3rd grade ELA. The state average for ELA proficiency in 3rd grade 50%, while the school average at Sparr was 32%. Some factors that contribute to this gap include novice teachers and an incoming cohort that has historically struggled with proficiency in comparison to district and state averages.

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

Sparr experienced the most improvement in the area of Mathematics, increasing from 52% proficient to 59% proficient. New actions taken that contributed to this growth included selection and creation of appropriately aligned content and items, and intensive coaching in the area of Mathematics.

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

An area of concern includes the percentage of students in grades 3 and 4 scoring a level 1.

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

Our highest priorities include Improving tier 1 instruction by honing in on alignment and rigor, maximizing instruction time, and emphasizing data-driven instruction. These efforts will enhance tier 1 instruction, allowing teachers to grow in their capacity which will in turn yield increased student achievement and growth. We will pour our efforts into all of our students, with additional support for our upcoming 4th grades students (the cohort that saw the largest gap between the average proficiency when compared to the state average).

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.

Goal: To increase learner ELA proficiency by improving and enhancing tier 1 instruction that is rigorous and appropriately aligned to the standard/benchmark.

The need for increased ELA proficiency among learners reveals a critical need for enhanced Tier 1 instruction that includes instruction that is aligned to the standard and the appropriate rigor of the standard/benchmark.

During the 2022-2023 school year, our ELA FSA data shows the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3: 68% of 3rd grade, 49% of 4th grade, and 52% of 5th grade. Improvements in the area of Tier 1 instruction will result in increased ELA proficiency among learners.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we provide students with rigorous ELA instruction that is aligned to the benchmark(s), including formative assessments, then proficiency will increase at least 5% in each grade level.

On the 2023 ELA FSA, 32% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 51% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 48% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2023 ELA FSA, 35% of 3rd grade, 47% of 4th grade, and 53% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher.

Monitoring:

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

In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:

K-5: PM 1, PM 2, PM 3

3-5: DPMA's (District Progress Monitoring Assessments) and BA's (Benchmark Assessments)

Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.

During classroom walk throughs, alignment/rigor, pacing, and levels of student engagement will be noted by administration and feedback will be provided to teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Renee Johnson (renee.johnson@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 evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is a revised collaborative planning process and professional development. Collaboration will include the utilization of test-item clarifications provided by the Florida Dept. of Education to help ensure that the tasks and lessons are aligned to the standard/benchmark and at the appropriate rigor level and meeting two times per week with instructional coaches and administration. Professional development will include a focus on pacing and student engagement during direct instruction (.82 effect size on Hattie's index of teaching), and formative assessment (.9 effect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During collaboration, teachers will have the opportunity to come together to share instructional strategies, learning goals, and tasks they plan to incorporate during the following week. This will be an opportunity for instructional coaches (content area experts) and administration (instructional leaders) to provide feedback in an effort to ensure standard/benchmark-based, rigor appropriate content and tasks and highly effective instructional practices prior to the execution of the lesson. Further, during this time teachers will share and analyze data collected from classroom-based common assessments to review best practices for review and remediation.

Professional development will be provided to instructional staff on utilizing test item specifications for the purposes of task alignment and lesson planning. Further, professional development and coaching on pacing, student engagement, and formative assessment will be incorporated.

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 2 - Moderate 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 classroom walkthroughs by administration seeking content and task alignment to the standard(s)/benchmark(s) and evidence of collaboration. Walkthroughs will be documents and data tracked weekly.

Person Responsible: Renee Johnson (renee.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing.

Specialized student grouping/support for tier 1 support within the ELA block, will allow students to get more intensive support based on their area(s) of needed.

Person Responsible: Renee Johnson (renee.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing. Data reviewed quarterly to adjust groups, if needed.

#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.

A critical area of focus is the behavioral and social emotional needs of our students. During the 2022-2023 school year, while Sparr saw a reduction in overall discipline referrals, the data is significant in that it is noted that many of the referrals are occurring due to incidents involving the same 40 (10% of the student population) students.

Providing students and families with social and emotional support will increase student mental health, which will in turn have a positive impact on academics, parent involvement, and decrease undesirable behavior.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 2023-2024 school year, Sparr will see a reduction in students who have >5 office discipline referrals by 25% (30 students or less).

Monitoring:

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

The multi-disciplinary team meets monthly to review discipline and SEL data, and develop individualized plans for social emotional or behavioral support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dolores Urso (dolores.urso@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 Multidisciplinary Team will meet regularly to review student data and make individual an plan of action for each student on Tier 2 or Tier 3 for SEL or discipline.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Support and coaching in the areas of appropriate response to social emotional needs will be provided.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Effective MTSS practices through the multidisciplinary team will allow for individualized support for each student who is identified as tier 2 or tier 3 for social emotional/behavior support.

Person Responsible: Renee Johnson (renee.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing.

#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.

Goal: To provide high quality tier 1 instruction and to provide specialized support to our SWD in an effort to increase their academic proficiency.

During the 2022-2023 school year, our SWD subgroup federal percent of points index is 44.1%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we provide high quality tier 1 instruction and specialized support to our SWD, then our federal percent of point index will improve 5% by the end of the 2023-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through regular, consistent data analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Renee Johnson (renee.johnson@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 evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is a revised collaborative planning process and professional development. Collaboration will include the utilization of test-item clarifications provided by the Florida Dept. of Education to help ensure that the tasks and lessons are aligned to the standard/benchmark and at the appropriate rigor level level and meeting two times per week with instructional coaches and administration. Professional development will include a focus on pacing and student engagement during direct instruction (.82 effect size on Hattie's index of teaching), and formative assessment (.9 effect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During collaboration, teachers will have the opportunity to come together to share instructional strategies, learning goals, and tasks they plan to incorporate during the following week. This will be an opportunity for instructional coaches (content area experts) and administration (instructional leaders) to provide feedback in an effort to ensure standard/benchmark-based, rigor appropriate content and tasks and highly effective instructional practices prior to the execution of the lesson. Further, during this time teachers will share and analyze data collected from classroom-based common assessments to review best practices for review and remediation.

Professional development will be provided to instructional staff on utilizing test item specifications for the purposes of task alignment and lesson planning. Further, professional development and coaching on pacing, student engagement, and formative assessment will be incorporated.

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.

During collaboration, teachers will have the opportunity to come together to share instructional strategies, learning goals, and tasks they plan to incorporate during the following week. This will be an opportunity for instructional coaches (content area experts) and administration (instructional leaders) to provide feedback in an effort to ensure standard/benchmark-based, rigor appropriate content and tasks and highly effective instructional practices prior to the execution of the lesson. Further, during this time teachers will share and analyze data collected from classroom-based common assessments to review best practices for review and remediation.

Professional development will be provided to instructional staff on utilizing test item specifications for the purposes of task alignment and lesson planning. Further, professional development and coaching on pacing, student engagement, and formative assessment will be incorporated.

Person Responsible: Renee Johnson (renee.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly.

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).

With one subgroup (students with disabilities) at 44.1%, Sparr is in ATSI status. During SAC, leadership, and faculty meetings, progress monitoring data for our SWD is reviewed and feedback is garnered to allow for input on high impact strategies that will best support our students with disabilities.

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

Goal: To increase learner ELA proficiency by improving and enhancing tier 1 instruction that is rigorous and appropriately aligned to the standard/benchmark.

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, kindergarten, first grade, and second grade will see a combined proficiency of 55% (or higher) as indicated by the Florida PM3.

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

Goal: To increase learner ELA proficiency by improving and enhancing tier 1 instruction that is rigorous and appropriately aligned to the standard/benchmark.

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, third, fourth, and fifth grade will see a combined proficiency of 50% (or higher) as indicated by the Florida FAST.

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

On the 2023 PM3, Reading Overall proficiency indicated that kindergarten achieved 75% proficient, our first grade students achieved 39% proficient, and second grade achieved 40% proficient.

On the 2023-24 Progress Monitoring 3, Kindergarten will be 70%% proficient, first grade will be 75% proficient, and 2nd grade will be 45% proficient.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

On the 2023 ELA FSA, 32% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 51% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 48% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher.

On the 2023 ELA FSA , 37% of 3rd grade, 51% of 4th grade, and 53% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher.

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.

In addition to our classroom formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:

Grade 3: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2023, AP2 January 2024, and AP3 May 2024.

3-5: District DPMAs Q1 October 2023, Q2 December 2023, and Q3 March 2024.

3-5: District Benchmark Assessments (BAs) throughout the school year.

K-5- Star and FAST PM 1 September/October 2023, PM2 December/January 2023/2024, and PM 3 April/May 2024.

Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.

During classroom walk throughs, levels of student engagement will be noted by administration and feedback will be provided to teachers.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Johnson, Renee, renee.johnson@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?

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is a enhanced collaborative planning process for the purposes of enhanced tier 1 instruction. Collaboration will include the utilization of test-item clarifications provided by the Florida Dept. of Education to help ensure that the tasks and lessons are aligned to the standard/benchmark and at the appropriate rigor level level and meeting two times per week with instructional coaches and administration. Tier 1 instruction will be improved due to appropriate pacing and student engagement during direct instruction (.82 effect size on Hattie's index of teaching), and formative assessment (.9 effect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching).

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?

During collaboration, teachers will have the opportunity to come together to share instructional strategies, learning goals, and tasks they plan to incorporate during the following week, This will be an opportunity for instructional coaches (content area experts) and administration (instructional leaders) to provide feedback in an effort to ensure standard/benchmark-based, rigor appropriate content and tasks and highly effective instructional practices prior to the execution of the lesson. Further, during this time teachers will share and analyze data collected from classroom-based common assessments to review best practices for review and remediation.

Professional development will be provided to instructional staff on utilizing test item specifications for the

purposes of task alignment and lesson planning. Further, professional development and coaching on pacing, student engagement, and formative assessment will be incorporated.

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
Action Step 1- Develop and implement professional learning opportunities that hone in on tier 1 needs. Tier 1 instruction will be consistently evaluated to identify trends and complete needs analyses. The data collected from tier 1 instruction observations will help determine focus and objectives for professional learning opportunities. Upon implementation, follow up will occur to inspect transference of intended skills to the classroom.	Johnson, Renee, renee.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us
Action Step 2- The Sparr Literacy team will meet monthly to evaluate student literacy assessment data (District Progress Monitoring Assessments, FAST assessments and Benchmark Assessments) and classroom observation data. This information will be used to determine the literacy focus and a plan for supported literacy coaching, based on needs, will be devised. The literacy coach will serve as the literacy leader by supporting tier 1 literacy instruction by coaching and modeling for teachers.	Johnson, Renee, renee.johnson@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 SIP is shared and progress is disseminated out in a face to face setting via quarterly SAC meetings. The information is shared in parent friendly language, and the opportunity to clarifying questions is provided.

<https://www.marionschools.net/sre>

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))

The school builds positive relationships with parents and other key stakeholders in various ways. A communication plan in which each teacher/staff member makes a quarterly positive phone call, and social media is used as a platform to share great things happening at Sparr, which increasing community engagement.

<https://www.marionschools.net/sre>

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)

With appropriate coaching and support, and adequately aligned instruction, teachers will experience increased capacity to deliver highly effective, benchmark-aligned tier 1 instruction which will in turn maximize student academic growth, thus strengthening the academic program in the school.

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

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))

Sparr's multidisciplinary team (MDT) has strong systems and structures which allow high levels of productivity and efficiency. The team meets biweekly to review student behavior and social emotional data. Upon the data analysis, the team modifies individual supportive plans based on student needs to support their mental, emotional, and behavioral health needs.

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))

Sparr has founded the Future Aviators Academy. This one-of-a-kind program ignites passion, aspiration, and intrigue in the aviation industry. This program works across all grade levels to improve STEM literacy and generate interest in STEM fields, particularly in students from underserved and underrepresented communities.

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).

The Multidisciplinary team has a system in which students are placed on tier 1, tier 2, or tier 3. Tier 2 and 3 include more intensive plans for individualized support, implementing district approved interventions programs.

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))

Professional learning occurs, at minimum, once per month on Early Release Days. Sparr's professional learning plan hones in on critical areas including alignment and rigor, maximizing instructional time, and data-driven instruction.

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))

Sparr Elementary has an inclusive PreK program in which students may transition seamlessly from Preschool to kindergarten.