Emerald Shores Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Emerald Shores Elementary School

404 EMERALD RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[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.

As a team, we will build a respectful, supportive community focused on clear communication, consistent expectations, and engaging learning opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To inspire and motivate students to become compassionate, productive, and honest citizens within our society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Houston, Stacy	Principal	MCIES Observations; Summative Evaluations for Instructional & Non-instructional employees; Crisis Management; CIMS/SIP; Budgets; PFEP; Staff Discipline; Staff Handbook; Parent Handbook; SAC/PTO; Community Liaison.
Cabrales, Maria	Assistant Principal	MCIES Observations; MTSS - Behavior plans & PSTs for specified students; PMP meetings; Assist in preparing staff for ALICE & Fire drills; MDT Team; Materials management - textbook inventory & distribution, chromebook carts, destiny; Threat assessment referrals; Enter PD courses in TNL; Safety Chair; Volunteer approval; Testing Coordinator; Weekly INformer Creation & Panther Press.
Swain, Angela	Assistant Principal	MCIES Observations; Pre-K Point Person; MTSS - Academic PMPs & PSTs for specified students; Curriculum - PK - 5th grade; 3rd Grade Portfolios; Skyward Gradebook - Report Cards/Interim Reports; Award's & Graduation Ceremonies - Planning, organization, & ordering; EOY Student sorts & assist IPC with student scheduling in Skyward; Elementary Testing Coordinator; 504 Meetings & ESOL Staffings; Weekly INformer Creation & Panther Press.
Ewart, Samantha	School Counselor	Guidance Services; IEP Staffings as needed; MTSS; Campus Life Changer / SEL; School Liaison for outside agencies; DCF calls; MDT Meeting Coordinator; Suicide Risk; Coordinate & Organize Donations; Counseling Groups; Holiday Assistance; Food Backpacks; 504 Contact; CUME Folder Reviews; Monitor Attendance/Tardies; ESE Students - Tier 3; Gifted, Academic, Mental, & Behavioral Referrals.
Hallford, Meredith	School Counselor	Guidance Services; IEP Staffings as needed; MTSS; Campus Life Changer / SEL; School Liaison for outside agencies; DCF calls; MDT Meeting Coordinator; Suicide Risk; Coordinate & Organize Donations; Counseling Groups; Holiday Assistance; Food Backpacks; 504 Contact; CUME Folder Reviews; Monitor Attendance/Tardies; ESE Students - Tier 3; Gifted, Academic, Mental, & Behavioral Referrals.
Maio, Brittany	Reading Coach	Model & provide classroom support/coaching for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; i-Ready Monitoring for reading; Attend & facilitate weekly

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		collaborative planning for ELA; MTSS Interventions coordinator; Enter reading data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various reading programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for paraprofessionals; Implement & monitor data folders for reading; Literacy Committee; Lead ITD.
Melendez, Estela	Math Coach	Model & provide classroom support/coaching for teachers; MTSS - attend PMP Meetings for academics; i-Ready Monitoring for math; Attend & facilitate weekly collaborative planning for math; MTSS Interventions coordinator; Enter math data into MTSS spreadsheets; Train, monitor, & support teachers with various math programs - core, supplemental, & intervention; Conduct trainings for para-professionals; Implement & monitor data folders for math.
Nereim, Matthew	Dean	Discipline; Cafeteria Supervisor - train paras; Assist in preparing staff for ALICE & Fire drills; Distribute Crisis Management plans; PST Meetings for Discipline; Transportation/Bus safety issues; Model & support teachers with Classroom Management; ISS Facilitator; Threat Risk Referrals; Alternative Placements/Expulsions; Patrols.

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 2/2/23 SAC meeting and the 2/22/2023 School Level Leadership & Literacy meeting the Principal shared the 22-23 School Improvement Plan and the draft Comprehensive Needs Assessment for the 23-24 school year. All members from both of these committees were asked to review both documents and bring ideas and questions to the next scheduled meetings for both groups in order to make changes and/or additions to the 23-24 School Improvement Plan.

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 goals are monitored monthly during School Leadership meetings where data is reviewed. Academic, behavioral, observational, and attendance data will be reviewed monthly and action Plans are implemented every 20 days specific to the SIP goals and the data that is presented.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	63%
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
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	43	27	45	33	30	37	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	21	28	36	39	49	42	0	0	0	215
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	7	9	11	17	12	10	0	0	0	66
Course failure in Math	4	8	13	16	16	13	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	45	30	16	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	48	48	33	0	0	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	25	37	45	30	16	0	0	0	172

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	32	39	52	33	58	48	0	0	0	262

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	2	2	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	52	43	38	51	41	46	0	0	0	271
One or more suspensions	18	35	22	79	21	59	0	0	0	234
Course failure in ELA	7	11	8	14	5	9	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	5	9	9	11	4	11	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	21	43	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	28	44	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	12	26	33	33	21	43	0	0	0	168

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	14	32	28	62	35	55	0	0	0	226

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	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	52	43	38	51	41	46	0	0	0	271
One or more suspensions	18	35	22	79	21	59	0	0	0	234
Course failure in ELA	7	11	8	14	5	9	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	5	9	9	11	4	11	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	21	43	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	28	44	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	12	26	33	33	21	43	0	0	0	168

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	14	32	28	62	35	55	0	0	0	226

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	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	16
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*	40			42	47	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				61	56	61	41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				75	51	52	41		
Math Achievement*	36			50	54	60	31		
Math Learning Gains				61	62	64	31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59	52	55	29		
Science Achievement*	32			25	42	51	21		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	60			47			69		

* 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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	200
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
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	23	Yes	2	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	18	Yes	1	1
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	36	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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	53			

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%
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	51			

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	40			36			32					60
SWD	18			24							3	
ELL	24			38							4	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			21			6				4	
HSP	42			36			41				5	57
MUL	61			46							2	
PAC												
WHT	45			45			40				4	
FRL	37			33			28				5	54

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	42	61	75	50	61	59	25					47
SWD	17	48	58	26	57	64	0					
ELL	40	91		42	91							47
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	33	51	71	40	48	43	20					
HSP	49	75		55	65		29					47
MUL	41	79		36	54							
PAC												
WHT	43	55	60	57	69		33					
FRL	38	60	78	45	59	63	19					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	35	41	41	31	31	29	21					69
SWD	10	21		3	25							
ELL	17	50		33	30							69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20	27		9	21	30	5					
HSP	42	45		38	36		26					67
MUL	32	67		21	27		0					
PAC												
WHT	43	41		46	37		35					
FRL	31	37	37	24	27	29	15					70

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	50%	49%	1%	54%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	31%	39%	-8%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	32%	48%	-16%	59%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	61%	-23%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	50%	-5%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	31%	43%	-12%	51%	-20%

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 lowest overall performance in proficiency was in our 5th grade science scores where only 31% of the 5th grade students scored at a level 3 or above. While this was the lowest area, it was still an increase of 6 percentage points. Our trends in this area are showing slow improvements over time.

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

The greatest decline from 2021-22 to 2022-23 was in overall Math proficiency where our students scored 10 percentage points lower, from 50% proficiency to 40% proficiency. One contributing factor was that we lost 6 experienced teachers from 3rd-5th grade and had to replace them with new and out of field teachers.

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.

Students in 3rd grade math scored 27 points below the state, with 32% proficient compared to the state average of 59% scoring at a level 3 or above. This group of students were the students in Kindergarten during Covid and 50% of the 3rd grade team were new teachers.

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

In 2021-22 the 3rd grade ELA scores were 42% at a level 3 or above. In the following year, 22-23, the same cohort of students now in 4th grade increased their proficiency to 47% at a level 3 or above.3 out of 5 teachers were experienced in 4th grade and we replaced one of the new teachers halfway through the year that did not have order or structures for learning developed in her classroom. We also had an academic coach assigned to the other new teacher providing support to the teacher and students. In January, specific students in each class were identified and scheduled to receive additional small group learning time (2-3 days a week) specific to the benchmarks they were struggling in by either an experienced teacher or an academic coach.

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

43% of 3rd graders scored a Level 1 on the PM 3 FAST assessment. 22 of these students were retained in 3rd grade.

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

1. Instructional Practice specifically related to Standards Aligned Instruction.
2. Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports.

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 Collaborative Planning

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

The proficiency rate in ELA increased by 1 point from 42% to 43% and the proficiency rates in math decreased by 10 percentage points from 50% to 40% proficient in grades 3-5. Tier 1 planning and instructional implementation continues to be a focus.

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

If we continue to provide all instructional staff professional learning focusing on intentional standards-based planning, how to effectively collect and use formative assessment data, and ongoing coaching in UDL & Kagan structures for engagement, then our overall ELA and math proficiency in grades 3-5 as measured by FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking) will increase by 5% from 43% to 48% in ELA and by 5% from 40% to 45% in math, and our ESE sub group will increase from 39% proficient to at least 43% proficient.

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

Members of the administrative team will each be assigned to participate in grade level planning. Each administrator will monitor the planning by doing weekly walkthroughs for their assigned grade levels and provide specific feedback related to the implementation of the collaborative planning sessions. District and state data will also be used to monitor classroom and student needs. Grade level Assignments: Cabrales - 4th & 5th grades; Houston - 1st & 3rd grades; and Swain - Kindergarten & 2nd grade. Each administrator will also review the ESE students in their assigned grade level on a monthly basis to determine if acceptable growth is occurring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@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.)

BA's (Benchmark Assessments), DPMA's (District Progress Monitoring Assessments), and the state FAST (Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking) progress monitoring assessments will be used throughout the year to monitor classroom and student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies, "Teachers that participate in effective and intentional planning and prediction have the potential to accelerate student achievement with an effect size of .76."

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.

Creation of a master schedule to support uninterrupted ELA and Math blocks that include time for small group instruction based on group and individual needs and a time for all team members to meet at least 2 times per week for collaborative planning in ELA and Math.

Person Responsible: Angela Swain (angela.swain@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Aug. 4, 2023

Members of the admin. team attends all collaborative planning sessions for assigned grade levels and then do walk-throughs in those subject areas the following week, providing specific growth feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible: Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Every week throughout the year.

Analyze all district & state data provided to create targeted action plans for groups of students including all ESE students, and to determine the coaching needs of instructors.

Person Responsible: Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Once a month during A-Team meetings data will be reviewed and action plans will be created for the following month based on student and teacher needs.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Positive Culture and Environment specifically related to positive behavior interventions and support. Students with disabilities were the only sub-group below the 41% required on the Federal Point Index, scoring 2 percentage points below at 39%.Discipline data revealed that Office Discipline referrals increased by over 200 referrals entered in 2022-23. A Student Climate Survey taken by 244 students in 2nd-5th grade showed that 62% of the students responding did not feel like students were behaving in class so that the teacher could teach and 54% of the respondents also felt that students are not kind to one another.

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

By providing teachers professional learning sessions in creating structures for learning in the classrooms, and providing students additional support for Positive Behavior Interventions, Office Discipline referrals will decrease by at least 5% compared to the 2022-23 school year.

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

After Professional Learning sessions occur, the Admin. team will do walk throughs based on specific criteria from the Professional Learning and teachers will receive growth feedback related to the learning and the walk through results with actionable next step for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@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.)

BA's (Benchmark Assessments), DPMA's (District Progress Monitoring Assessments), and the state FAST (Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking) progress monitoring assessments will be used throughout the year to monitor the academic and behavioral needs of our Students with Disabilities and other students needing support in positive behavior interventions. Walk through and observation data will be used to determine which teachers need to be placed on coaching plans for creating positive structures for learning within the daily classroom setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students on behavior intervention plans can cause diminished learning for an entire classroom of learners if the intervention is not carried out with fidelity.

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.

All instructional personnel will receive 2 different Professional Learning sessions during pre-school planning: 1. Structuring the Classroom Learning Environment; and 2. Kagan Cooperative Learning.

Person Responsible: Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Aug. 4, 2023

Faculty Focus Meetings and Cub Cadre' meetings will focus on the topics presented during the first action step and walk through schedules will be created to reinforce expectations and to provide growth feedback in these areas.

Person Responsible: Stacy Houston (stacy.houston@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Every week throughout the school year.

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

The majority of the Title 1 funds are allocated towards a Reading coach, a math coach, and a resiliency coach. Remaining funds are being budgeted for a Kagan Cooperative Learning PL session.

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

According to the FAST STAR Early Literacy and Reading PM 3, percentages of K-2 students scoring below the 40th percentile in reading are shown below:
Kindergarten = 56%
1st Grade = 55%
2nd grade = 63%

All students in K-2 receive instruction daily in the scientific based research program UFLI for 30 minutes daily and all students with substantial deficits in reading will receive scientifically research based interventions provided based on their area of need 2 times daily at 30 minutes per session.

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

According to FAST ELA PM 3, percentages scoring below 50% are shown below:
3rd grade = 69%
4th grade= 52%
5th grade = 50%
All students scoring below the level 3 will have identified, scientifically research based interventions provided based on their area of need 2 times daily at 30 minutes per session.

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

Based on the FAST - STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading Assessments the percentage of student in K-2 scoring above the 40th percentile will increase from 42% to 47%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the FAST ELA assessment the percentage of students in 3rd 4th and 5th grade on average will increase from 43% at or above a level 3 to 48% at or above level 3.

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.

Formative assessment data in individual classrooms will be monitored on a weekly basis during collaborative planning sessions to determine individual teacher needs on a regular basis. The administrative team will also monitor student results in the Benchmark Assessments, District Progress Monitoring Assessments, and the FAST ELA & MA Assessments. Monthly action plans centered around specific teachers ad students will be created, implemented, and monitored to support continued student success and growth.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Houston, Stacy, stacy.houston@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?

-SAVVAS myView Reading Program to support Tier 1 Instruction (K-5)
-UFLI Foundations to support Tier 1 (K-2) & additional lessons to support Tier 2 & 3 for individual students (K-3)
-Heggerty for Phonemic Awareness to support Tier 2 & 3 instruction (PK-2)
-Language Power to support Tier 2 & 3 instruction (K-5)
-Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, & Sight Words (SIPPS) to support Tier 2 & 3 instruction (varying levels for K-5)
-Read Naturally / Read Live! to support Tier 2 & 3 instruction (2-5)
-Lexia Core5 to support Tier 2 & 3 instruction(2-3)
Read 180 to support Tier 2 & 3 instruction (4-5)

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?

All of these programs provide a variety of options to support the varying learner deficiencies of phonological/phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension in order to offer individual students the right intervention for their individual area(s) of weakness.

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
Create a Master schedule that allows for any and all students needing the additional interventions above and beyond Tier 1 instruction the added time in their schedule providing enough personnel support during the scheduled time and identify the targeted population in each grade level.	Swain, Angela, angela.swain@marion.k12.fl.us
Provide needed training to personnel implementing the intervention programs.	Maio, Brittany, brittany.maio@marion.k12.fl.us
Begin the intervention programs and provide a monitoring schedule to determine the interventions are occurring twice daily and being implemented with fidelity.	Houston, Stacy, stacy.houston@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.

-SIP plan will be posted to the school's web-site @ https://www.marionschools.net/ems
-Shared with the SAC committee
-Printed and shared with families during the first ACT (Academic Conference Team) Night.

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 PFEP (Parent and Family Engagement Plan) will be posted to the school's web-site @ https://www.marionschools.net/ems
-The PFEP will be shared with families on Sept. 14, 2023 during the Title I Information meeting.
The PFEP will be copied and sent home to all 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))

The two Areas of Focus and actions included chosen will be how the school plans to strengthen the academic program.

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

N/A

<div style="background-color:#7ba7d7; padding:8px;">

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

</div>

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))

With a new School Counselor, Resiliency Coach, and outside counselor, more students can be targeted for counseling and mentoring supports in order to support the whole child.

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))

Career Day scheduled for March 8, 2024.

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 Dean, the Resiliency Coach, and the Teacher Interventionist will work with the Counseling department to identify students in need of Tiered Behavior Interventions and monitor progress in the interventions on a monthly basis.

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))

Teachers will attend Professional Learning sessions every Wednesday afternoon based on the Areas of Focus. Non-instructional personnel will receive Professional Leaning during the mornings of the 6 scheduled Early Release Days.

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))

VPK teachers and Kindergarten teachers meet at the end of the school year to share information about pre-school students moving to Kindergarten.