

Marion County Public Schools

# Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Stanton Weirsdale Elementary School

16705 SE 134TH TER, We IR Sdale, FL 32195

[ 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.

We are united in challenging students to reach their fullest potential in a safe, positive, caring environment which is conducive to teaching and learning.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a community school for student-centered learning that provides a family-friendly environment in order to develop successful and well-rounded global leaders.

### 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
Brodie, Cynthia	Principal	The principal oversees the day to day operations of the school. The principal also supports teachers and staff with curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning.
Parks, Megan	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports teachers and staff with curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning.
Alderman, Amy	Instructional Coach	Our content area specialist supports teachers and students with the delivery of ELA curriculum.
Tucker, Doris	Dean	Our student service manager develops and supports a school-wide positive behavior system and handles student discipline. She also puts into place processes and procedures that support student safety on campus.
Carson, Georgiana	Instructional Coach	Our content area specialist supports teachers and students with the delivery of Math curriculum.

#### 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.

The development of the SIP is a vital component of the School Advisory Council. Data is collected for all areas of the SIP and shared with all stakeholders. Multiple meetings are held to ensure that representation of all stakeholders is gathered and utilized when creating the SIP.

### 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 by the collection of data for the Areas of Improvement listed in the SIP. The data will be discussed at leadership team meetings as well as School Advisory Council. At these meetings, if revisions need to be made to ensure continuous improvement, then revisions will be documented and the process of monitoring for effective implementation and achievement will begin again.

### Demographic Data

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	34%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### 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	47	47	54	54	38	0	0	0	257	
One or more suspensions	7	12	3	21	25	19	0	0	0	87	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	10	4	19	21	4	9	0	0	0	67	
Course failure in Math	6	9	10	14	5	8	0	0	0	52	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	50	35	34	0	0	0	119	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	39	26	27	0	0	0	92	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	

**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	24	8	26	16	22	26	0	0	0	122

**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	1	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	44	29	26	41	20	34	0	0	0	194	
One or more suspensions	8	1	6	13	12	17	0	0	0	57	
Course failure in ELA	24	8	29	16	22	25	0	0	0	124	
Course failure in Math	18	6	27	9	24	18	0	0	0	102	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	44	24	35	0	0	0	103	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	42	19	35	0	0	0	96	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	21	22	46	38	40	0	0	0	184	

**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	24	8	26	16	22	26	0	0	0	122

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	44	29	26	41	20	34	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	8	1	6	13	12	17	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	24	8	29	16	22	25	0	0	0	124
Course failure in Math	18	6	27	9	24	18	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	44	24	35	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	42	19	35	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	21	22	46	38	40	0	0	0	184

**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	24	8	26	16	22	26	0	0	0	122

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	18
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*	27	44	53	33	46	56	36		
ELA Learning Gains				50			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			67		
Math Achievement*	40	50	59	42	50	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				60			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			62		
Science Achievement*	36	46	54	32	53	59	37		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					49	52			
Graduation Rate					41	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	57	59	57			53		

*\* 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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	183
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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
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	18	Yes	4	1
ELL	34	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	3	2
HSP	35	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	32	Yes	1	
FRL	28	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	35	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	23	Yes	2	1
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	46			

#### 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	27			40			36					58
SWD	12			25			15				4	
ELL	13			31							3	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			35							3	
HSP	25			44			27				5	58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	26			40			39				4	
FRL	22			35			35				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	33	50	58	42	60	50	32					57
SWD	12	43	50	29	56	52	6					
ELL	10	36		15	57							57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	45		11	9							
HSP	32	56		41	65		33					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	36	50	53	47	66	62	35					
FRL	28	48	58	36	60	50	30					58

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	36	54	67	43	51	62	37					53
SWD	10	36		12	41	54	8					
ELL	21			42								53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	14			31								
HSP	32	50		46	50		41					53
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	42	59	80	46	50	70	42					
FRL	30	53	71	36	52	67	34					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	32%	49%	-17%	54%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	48%	-17%	58%	-27%
03	2023 - Spring	23%	39%	-16%	50%	-27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	48%	-6%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	53%	-12%	61%	-20%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	50%	-11%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	43%	-7%	51%	-15%

### 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 indicates scores on ELA proficiency continue to decrease from 2018/2019 to current 2023 from 43% to 29% overall. The contributing factors to the low performance include students not advancing to the next grade level proficient in reading with a deficit of one or more years which in turn indicates a Tier 1 instructional concern. In addition, lack of teachers in classrooms resulting in raised class size in fourth and fifth grades contributed to the scores.

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

The data indicates scores on ELA proficiency continue to decrease from 2018/2019 to current 2023 from 43% to 29% overall. The contributing factors to the low performance include students not advancing to the next grade level proficient in reading with a deficit of one or more years which in turn indicates a Tier 1 instructional concern. In addition, lack of teachers in classrooms resulting in raised class size in fourth and fifth grades contributed to the scores.

**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 when compared to the state average of 50% is third grade proficiency at 23%. Factors/trends that contributed to the gap are lack of foundational skills in primary grades, student attendance, and lack of reading comprehension skills.

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

The Science data component showed the most improvement with a 5% increase in proficiency from the prior school year. Implementation of science lessons for 5th grade with the district Science Program Specialist as well as one day a month being focused on hands on experiments assisted in the increase of proficiency scores.

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

One area of concern from the EWS data, is attendance. Schoolwide attendance was at 89% when the goal set was 92%. Attendance programs are in place with tracking and student incentives. Our Family Engagement Liaison will be focusing on the attendance of students as well as students that are routinely tardy to school and will work with the social worker to see how to assist families on getting their child to school on time. Another area of concern is suspensions/behavior referrals. There was an increase in suspensions/behavior referrals written which lends to a classroom management Tier 1 concern as 76 of the referrals were Level 1 (classroom management).

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

1. Raising ELA achievement
2. Raising Math achievement
3. Increasing student attendance on a daily basis
4. Decreasing student referrals by increasing student engagement in the classroom

**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 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.

Attendance for the 2022-2023 school year was an average of 89% daily attendance. Behavior referrals had a total of 644 referrals for the school year (72 - Level 1; 544 Level 2; 27 Level 3; 1 Level 4). 323 referrals were classroom related, 176 bus related, and 145 in other locations. If students are not in attendance and/or having behavioral difficulties, then the students are not benefiting from a positive learning environment.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Student attendance will average 92% daily in the 2023-2024 school year resulting in a 3% attendance gain. In addition, student behavioral referrals will be reduced to less than 250 total referrals for the school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student daily attendance will be monitored through the guidance department with the IPC and Family Engagement Liaison. Weekly attendance reports will be generated and students will be tracked and parent contact will be made. The Student Service Manager will track weekly referrals as well as targeted student referrals. Leadership team will review data and make plans to support weekly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Doris Tucker (doris.tucker@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 school will utilize the Attendance Works program that will support reducing chronic absences. In addition, the Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) program will be utilized for behavior concerns on campus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

AttendanceWorks.org is an organization that provides resources nationwide to support reducing chronic absences and is supported by the school district. The PBIS program and framework is supported by the school district and utilized by student service managers to support the behavior program.

**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.

- \* IPC and Family Engagement Liaison runs reports and determines students with chronic absences.
- \* Family Engagement Liaison creates an incentive program and tracking documents for students.



- \* Students on the tracking forms meet with Family Engagement Liaison and school counselor to set goals for attendance and then monitored bi-weekly.
- \* Student Service Manager runs discipline report from previous school year and determines target students that need support in reducing referral rates
- \* Student Service Manager meets with teachers/parents to create a behavior plan/tracking form
- \* Leadership Team meetings weekly and reviews data and makes adjustments as needed

**Person Responsible:** Doris Tucker (doris.tucker@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Starting August 10, 2023 and data will be reviewed weekly and discussed at weekly leadership team meetings.

**#2. 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.

Area of focus being targeted is ESSA Subgroup relating to Students with Disabilities as proficiency score is below 41% of requirement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

State student data will reflect a minimum proficiency of 41% or higher for ESSA Subgroup Students with Disabilities.

**Monitoring:**

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

Progress monitoring of state and district assessments will be utilized to ensure students are making progress and becoming proficient in grade level benchmarks. Monitoring of task alignment during weekly collaboration by way of student outcomes on check for understandings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amy Alderman (amy.alderman@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.)

Depending on the screener that will be given to the students, the students will be placed in SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words), Leveled Literacy Intervention, or Read 180 programs. The framework for Gradual Release of Responsibility as well as small group instruction will be utilized with this target groups of students. Small group instruction will review Tier 1 instruction to increase student proficiency in B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each program targets a specific area of intervention and has a moderate to strong ESSA rating.

**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.

- \* Literacy Coach and MTSS Coach will determine which students will need the intervention program.
- \* Teacher and/or paraprofessional will provide instruction minimum three (3) days a week for thirty (30) minutes per session.
- \* Data analysis of assessments and progress monitoring bi-weekly with teacher and/or paraprofessional and MTSS Coach
- \* Monitor intervention fidelity and use of data

**Person Responsible:** Megan Parks (megan.parks@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Start date for interventions is August 28, 2023 and bi-weekly monitoring of data.

### #3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

#### 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.

ESSA subgroup relating to Black/African-American students was identified as being below the 41% requirement.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

State student data will reflect a minimum proficiency rate of 41% or more in ESSA Subgroup of Black/African-American students.

#### Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data from state and district assessments will be utilized to ensure students are meeting/exceeding grade level benchmark expectations. Teachers will plan for implementation of benchmarks and ensure task alignment is accurate to the benchmark.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Megan Parks (megan.parks@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.)

Depending on the screener that will be given to the students, the students will be placed in SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words), Leveled Literacy Intervention, or Read 180 programs. The framework for Gradual Release of Responsibility as well as small group instruction will be utilized with this target groups of students. Small group instruction will review Tier 1 instruction to increase student proficiency in B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Each program targets a specific area of intervention and has a moderate to strong ESSA rating.

#### 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.

- \* Literacy Coach and MTSS Coach will determine which students will need the intervention program.
- \* Teacher and/or paraprofessional will provide instruction minimum three (3) days a week for thirty (30) minutes per session.
- \* Data analysis of assessments and progress monitoring bi-weekly with teacher and/or paraprofessional and MTSS Coach
- \* Monitor intervention fidelity and use of data

**Person Responsible:** Amy Alderman (amy.alderman@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Starting August 28, 2023 and then bi-weekly.

#### #4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

##### 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.

ESSA subgroup English Language Learners reflects proficiency below 41% resulting in needing improvement.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

State student data will reflect a minimum proficiency rate of 41% or more for students that are English Language Learners.

##### Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data via state and district assessments will be evaluated to ensure that students are mastering grade level benchmarks. ESOL paraprofessional and teachers will track student performance on tasks aligned to benchmarks through weekly checks for understanding.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Megan Parks (megan.parks@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.)

During MTSS block, English Language Learners will participate in Language Power intervention program. The framework for Gradual Release of Responsibility as well as small group instruction will be utilized with this target groups of students. Small group instruction will review Tier 1 instruction to increase student proficiency in B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Language Power was chosen as it provides level-appropriate text and has rigorous instruction and accelerates students language proficiency which in turns elevates student achievement.

##### 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.

- \* Literacy Coach and MTSS Coach will determine which students will need Language Power intervention program.
- \* ESOL paraprofessional will provide Language Power instruction minimum three (3) days a week for thirty (30) minutes per session.
- \* Data analysis of assessments and progress monitoring bi-weekly with ESOL paraprofessional and MTSS Coach
- \* Monitor intervention fidelity and use of data

**Person Responsible:** Megan Parks (megan.parks@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Intervention will start on August 28, 2023 and monitoring of data will be bi-weekly.

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

After reviewing data from district assessments, state assessment data, and classroom assessments, it is evident that planning for Tier I reading instruction with an emphasis on foundational skills instruction and task alignment is needed. When students can't read on grade level it affects students' ability to learn in all subject areas.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Proficiency in the area of ELA will increase by 5% on the 2024 F.A.S.T. The increased proficiency in ELA will also increase math proficiency by 5% on the 2024 F.A.S.T. and science proficiency will improve by 5% on the 2024 NGSSS Science assessment. The increase of student achievement will also raise the ESSA Subgroups that are below 41% requirement.

**Monitoring:**

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

Weekly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data (such as F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring, MTSS data, etc.), will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will utilize well-planned checks for understanding and other formative assessment data to provide targeted small group instruction with administration monitoring implementation weekly. The CAS in Literacy and Math will provide support and guidance on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment, and check for understanding.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cynthia Brodie (cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

Professional development on student achievement (.51 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategies) and strategies to teach foundational skills will be provided. Through PLCs, collaboration meetings, and staff development opportunities teachers will learn how to increase students' vocabulary to explain their thinking and increase opportunities for students to initiate questions in class discussions. Teachers will collaboratively plan using standards-based resources and planning for high order questioning in whole group and small group instruction. Teachers will plan for remedial and small group instruction with students in collaborative planning twice per week with content area specialists and administration. Teachers will increase students' opportunities for writing, class discussions, and reading through all subject areas. This strategy will be regularly monitored as teachers use checks for understanding through brief writing opportunities for students to explain their thinking and understanding in all subject areas.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that students who have increased opportunities for writing and reading in all areas, increase their overall abilities in all subjects. We will use ELA textbook adopted curriculum SAVVAS, and iReady Teacher Toolbox lessons, Top Score Writing curriculum, Social Studies, STEMscopes, DBQ's,



interactive notebooks, differentiated instruction using check for understanding data, and multiple intervention resources to improve learning gains. In addition, research shows that planned, explicit, and rigorous Tier 1 instruction, along with task alignment, increases student learning in the classroom.

#### **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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

### **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).

To review funding and allocate resources based on needs the following steps will occur: Identify specific needs and priorities, this will include reviewing existing data and conducting surveys. Define clear objectives and goals for the allocation of resources will be established. These objectives will be aligned to identified needs and will be measurable as set forth in the School Improvement Plan. The school will then complete a budget analysis to review and determine what resources are needed in order to increase student proficiency. Finally, a comprehensive plan for resource allocation will be developed and closely monitored for continued improvement and effectiveness.

### **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**

The 2023 FAST ELA data shows the following percent of grades K-2 students scored below proficiency 43% in Kindergarten, 62% in 1st grade, and 46% in 2nd grade. Through collaborative planning we will use the gradual release model to strengthen Tier 1 instruction.

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

The 2023 FAST ELA data shows the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3 of proficiency 78% in 3rd grade, 64% in 4th grade, and 69% in 5th grade. Through collaborative planning we will use the gradual release model to strengthen Tier 1 instruction.

### **Measurable Outcomes**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

### **Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**

If the focus of collaboration, planning, and professional development is on structured Tier 1 instruction including foundational skills then proficiency will increase from 57% to 65% in Kindergarten, 38% to 45% in 1st grade, and 54% to 59% in 2nd grade.

### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

If the focus of collaboration, planning, and professional development is on structured Tier 1 with fidelity and consistency, then overall proficiency will increase from 22% to 39% in 3rd grade. 36% to 43% in 4th grade, and 31% to 40% in 5th grade.

### **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.

Professional development will be provided at faculty meetings and collaboration twice a week for forty-five minutes each with a focus on ELA and Math. Implementation of instructional strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, ESE/ESOL para utilizing strategies when working directly with specific students, students creating goals with teachers, data chats with students and staff, and parent communication and reports. Teachers and leadership team have classroom and school action plans that are reviewed and monitored for progress.

#### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brodie, Cynthia, [cynthia.brodie@marion.k12.fl.us](mailto:cynthia.brodie@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 programs being utilized to support instruction and remediation are aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Benchmarks, part of the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan, and are identified as evidence-based programs that meet Florida's requirements.

### 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?

The evidence-based practices/programs being utilized meet the ESSA requirements for interventions and address the educational need of students. John Hattie of "Visible Learning" states research shows class discussion has a 0.82 high effect size, cooperative learning has a 0.55 high effect size, and direct instruction with a 0.59 effect size. Students being taught the skills to collaborative work together, problem solve, and encourage one another to be engaged, is impactful and will show gains in learning.

### 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
Literacy Content Area Specialist (CAS) will work with teachers in collaboration, after school, professional learning communities, etc. to provide examples and instruction on how to set up student engagement structures in the classroom. The LCAS will provide professional development on the program being utilized for remediation of skills and basic foundational instruction (K-2). LCAS will model and monitor for effectiveness.	Alderman, Amy, amy.alderman@marion.k12.fl.us
Administration will work with the content area specialists, Family Engagement Liaison, and teachers in creating meaningful parent events that incorporates students teaching their parents strategies/structures that can be utilized at home throughout the school year. Support parents through instruction of foundational skills will support student learning in the home.	Parks, Megan, megan.parks@marion.k12.fl.us
Progress monitoring and data review meetings to address student outcomes and track student performance will take place with administration after each progress monitoring assessment. Administration and teachers will create action plans for individual students not meeting the proficiency target for the grade level and track the data and make adjustments as needed. Students will be placed in remediation and specific direct instruction opportunities based on the data.	Brodie, Cynthia, cynthia.brodie@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.

Stanton-Weirsdale Elementary School disseminates the information of the SIP and SWP in various formats including and not limited to school website ([www.marionschools.net/swe](http://www.marionschools.net/swe)), monthly newsletters, copies in the school guidance department, shared at Annual Title I meeting as well as the School Advisory Council meetings. The SIP and SWP is made available to all stakeholders including the community partnerships. The SIP and SWP is available in both English and Spanish to service our families and community. Progress throughout the school year on the progression of the SIP and SWP will be shared with stakeholders through the school website, newsletters, and School Advisory Council meetings that meet quarterly.

**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 Advisory Council meets quarterly and develops the Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP). This plan is shared with parents at Annual Title I meeting, parent conferences, school website ([www.marionschools.net/swe](http://www.marionschools.net/swe)). In the PFEP, building relationships is addressed through open communication with all stakeholders through meetings, conferences, and trainings as well as professional development for all school staff on building positive and open communication. The school also utilizes Skyward messaging and Class DoJo as a form of open communication with families.

**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))**

To help strengthen the academic program at Stanton-Weirsdale Elementary School as well as provide enrichment and accelerated curriculum, the school is ensuring learning is taking place in various formats. One area is adding the 21st Century Program after school for enrichment programs and exposing students to various learning experiences that challenge the students. Building the "Gifted" program is a focus that is being supported by each grade level having a designated class that "gifted" students or possible gifted students in the classroom so the designated gifted teacher can co-teach and support the students within their academic surroundings expanding the program from being a "pull-out" only program which in turn supports accelerating the curriculum and learning of 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

#### **Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

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

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

The school guidance counselor creates a counseling plan with goals set for the school year. Included in the plan are designated programs used to address student social emotional needs as well as academic needs. The counselor works with teachers to identify students who would benefit from social skills groups, additional support, and mentoring services. Our school social worker works with the counselor to provide more specific counseling services.

**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))**

NA

**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).**

Stanton-Weirsdale Elementary School has a school based behavior program with incentives for positive behavior as well as interventions for students who require additional support for their behavior. The behavior program is a tiered program with interventions, including check in/check out, behavior tracking form individualized per student, and hold Problem Solving Team meetings to review the data. The behavior program supports all students including students with disabilities with behavior plans.

**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))**

Stanton-Weirsdale Elementary School has a Professional Development Plan that lays out the school year for professional development opportunities for teachers and paraprofessionals. This plan includes training on early release days, weekly Professional Learning Communities, as well as collaboration. The focus is on academic benchmarks as well as creating assessments that provide data that is tracked for student achievement. The PD is focused on the Gradual Release Model and Standards Driven Instruction. The school participates in district trainings that are geared for all stakeholders and years of teaching.

**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))**

Stanton-Weirsdale Elementary School participates in VPK as well as provides an opportunity for any student enrolled for Kindergarten to attend a week of Kindergarten Kickstart in July that helps students experience school and learn the campus and expectations. The school participates in district quarterly programs that specialize in preparing students and families in preschool to be ready for Kindergarten.