Marion County Public Schools

Harbour View Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Harbour View Elementary School

8445 SE 147TH PL, Summerfield, FL 34491

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;   2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;   3. Have a school grade of D or F; or   4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at Harbour View Elementary is to empower ALL members of our school community to access and attain the skills needed for lifelong success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learning to Succeed

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
Baxley, Joy	Principal	Lead teachers, support Collaborative Planning, manage resources, allocate budgets, increase student proficiency
Pollard, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Place students, support teachers in collaborative planning, monitor testing, analyze and share data, manage interventions - placement and training, PMP meetings. Specifically supporting First, Third, and Fifth grades in academic and behavioral supports that are needed.
Light, Vera	School Counselor	support teachers and students, run small groups by need, train and support Caring School Community, support PBIS. Specifically supporting VPK, Kindergarten, Second, and Fourth in academic and behavioral needs.
Nettles-Brown, Jannissa	Dean	Support PBIS, manage discipline, train and support classroom management, schedule and execute safety drills, manage referrals and consequences, manage Tier 2 and 3 behavior students
Salem, Sheri	Math Coach	Math program fidelity and data, math intervention training and placement, support collaborative planning, teach as needed, coach as available.
Swinehart, Charolette	Reading Coach	ELA program data, support collaborative planning, intervention training, placement and fidelity, PMP decisions, support collaborative planning, teach as needed, coach as available
Sugar, Brenda	School Counselor	support teachers and students, run small groups by need, train and support Caring School Community, support PBIS. Specifically supporting First, Third, and Fifth grades in academic and behavioral supports that are needed.
Ahearn, Katie	Assistant Principal	Place students, support teachers in collaborative planning, monitor testing, analyze and share data, manage interventions - placement and training, PMP meetings. Specifically supporting VPK, Kindergarten, Second, and Fourth in academic and behavioral needs.
Bento, Shannon	Other	Communications with all stakeholders in order to ensure attendance, systems, and compliance paperwork is completed and sustained. Answer phone calls, complete paperwork, and create routines for fidelity financial compliance.
Kissam, Bethany	Instructional Coach	3rd grade intervention, level1 and retainees

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nelson, Sara	Administrative Support	Media Specialist - support literacy in classrooms with BEST books, serve as approval person for all reading materials with SAC, teach digital citizenship courses

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.

Our SAC committee includes the required stakeholders, and they have input in to the School Improvement Plan and PFEP. We meet quarterly. Employees who are not on SAC are involved through faculty meetings.

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))

Each time we complete state progress monitoring, we see if we are making progress towards our goals. We also do this after each district assessment, and the results are discussed on collaborative planning with an action plan made to address issues. The admin team looks at discipline data monthly to determine areas of concern that need to be addressed.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	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: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	60	49	49	43	32	36	0	0	0	269
One or more suspensions	8	14	6	22	22	19	0	0	0	91
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	21	16	28	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	21	16	28	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	15	38	30	65	55	30	0	0	0	233
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	8	14	65	54	30	0	0	0	171
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	38	30	65	0	0	0	0	0	150
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	26	35	44	59	48	54	0	0	0	266

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	1	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	64	55	43	57	35	46	0	0	0	300
One or more suspensions	7	13	11	18	21	13	0	0	0	83
Course failure in ELA	23	20	54	20	12	32	0	0	0	161
Course failure in Math	14	15	44	35	7	22	0	0	0	137
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	59	38	39	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	72	42	36	0	0	0	150
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	3	6	30	0	0	0	0	0	46

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	23	25	50	39	12	30	0	0	0	179

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	64	55	43	57	35	46	0	0	0	300
One or more suspensions	7	13	11	18	21	13	0	0	0	83
Course failure in ELA	23	20	54	20	12	32	0	0	0	161
Course failure in Math	14	15	44	35	7	22	0	0	0	137
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	59	38	39	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	72	42	36	0	0	0	150
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	3	6	30	0	0	0	0	0	46

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	23	25	50	39	12	30	0	0	0	179

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	33			37	47	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				46	56	61	54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42	51	52	53		
Math Achievement*	33			41	54	60	43		
Math Learning Gains				61	62	64	71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50	52	55	67		
Science Achievement*	27			42	42	51	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	50			55			60		

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	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	176
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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
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	17	Yes	4	1
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	16	Yes	4	1
HSP	33	Yes	1	
MUL	27	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	35	Yes	1	

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	32	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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	49			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	45			
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	33			33			27					50
SWD	17			14			10				5	23
ELL	32			26							4	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	16			16							2	
HSP	30			28			25				5	49
MUL	24			29							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	37			38			29				4	
FRL	30			29			20				5	49

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	37	46	42	41	61	50	42					55
SWD	18	49	45	23	47	35	5					55
ELL	28	43	53	31	65	54	23					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20	42		16	58		27					
HSP	35	50	50	38	69	63	33					57
MUL	43			36								
PAC												
WHT	40	45	35	46	58	40	50					
FRL	33	46	41	36	58	54	39					60

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	39	54	53	43	71	67	49					60
SWD	19	36	47	24	63	64	10					
ELL	23	67		27	67		20					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	45		28	50		30					
HSP	35	64		36	70		39					61
MUL	29			47								
PAC												
WHT	42	51	47	47	72	63	55					
FRL	29	42	43	34	66	65	39					54

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	36%	49%	-13%	54%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	48%	-14%	58%	-24%
03	2023 - Spring	30%	39%	-9%	50%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	29%	48%	-19%	59%	-30%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	53%	-18%	61%	-26%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	50%	-7%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	27%	43%	-16%	51%	-24%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our lowest data was in Science achievement, with only 27% proficient. This data has been dropping since 2019. The drop this year was more significant, which may be attributed to half of our 5th grade teachers being either brand new teachers, or new to the standards. Additionally, we had an out of field teacher who resigned in the fall and the class was without a teacher for a while.

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

Our greatest decline was also in Science achievement, from 43% to 27%. This data has been dropping since 2019. The decline this year was more significant, which may be attributed to half of our 5th grade teachers being either brand new teachers, or new to the standards. Additionally, we had an out of field teacher who resigned in the fall and the class was without a teacher for a while.

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.

In 3rd grade, the greatest gap was in math - we had 29% proficient compared to 59% at the state.. In 4th grade, it was also in math with a discrepancy of 26 percentage points between 35% and 61%, and in 5th grade, it was science. The factors that contributed to science were described in the previous two questions. For 3rd and 4th grade math, beginning and experienced teachers lacked to skills to deliver effective instruction, despite extensive administrator led collaborative planning, Good plans were made, but not executed well. Teachers struggled to engage students. There was a lack of small group instruction, and one class had ten different teachers over the course of the year.

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

Unfortunately, there were no areas of improvement, not even in the areas of discipline or attendance, We started the year missing 14 instructional positions, and ended the year still having 6.

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

We have concerns with attendance, since students who are not there can't learn, even if there is quality instruction. LIkewise, with students behaviors escalating and causing them to be removed from class, they are not accessing the learning,

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

Our highest priority will always be student achievement, which we will address through improving attendance and reducing discipline issues. We have to do a better job of equipping teachers to handle Tier 1 issues in the classroom, as well as building their capacity to deliver engaging instruction in large and small groups,

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 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.

We selected the two areas of focus based on our data showing a drop in reading, math and science proficiency at all grade levels, and our attendance data showing a greater percentage of chronic absenteeism and the discipline data showing increased referrals and suspensions. The data is consistent for our underperforming subgroups of African-American, Multiracial, and students with disabilities.

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

If we align instruction to the benchmark, through continuing to support the collaborative planning process, with a focus on student engagement, then student proficiency will increase at least 3 percentage points for all subjects and grade levels. This would mean going from 35% to 38% in ELA, from 36% to 39% in Math, and from 27% to 30% in Science. Our multiracial, African-American and students with disabilities subgroups would have these same increases.

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

The evidence based instruction will be monitored by State Assessments such as, FAST 1, 2, and 3 and district level assessments. We will also be conducting administrative walkthroughs, observations, and frequent formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

The evidence based interventions that will be used for our targeted subgroups in ELA will be, Rewards and Leveled Literacy Intervention program. As well as, Magnetic Lessons from the IReady Teacher Tool Box. In the area of Math, our evidenced based intervention program will be Hands on Learning and the IReady Math Magnetic Lessons from the Teacher Toolbox. In Science we will be pulling small groups to reteach standards from our core curriculum.

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

The reasons for choosing these strategies are as follows, they have been approved in the intervention category by the district level, they have been vetted and approved texts in alignements to the new state law, they have many years of research base, and our faculty and staff have been trained in the proper implementation of these resources 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.

Create a schedule for each intervention group and assign personnel to deliver the evidence based instruction. Then we will share names of individual students for teacher to prepare.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Pollard (jennifer.pollard@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 16, 2023

Create a schedule for collaborative planning, develop the template, set up location and resources. Disperse to all faculty and staff who will be attending the collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Katie Ahearn (katie.ahearn@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 1, 2023

Develop a schedule for regular classroom walkthroughs for observations. Develop a schedule for administration and coaches to support collaborative planning. Develop a schedule and disperse schedule for formal and informal observations.

Person Responsible: Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 15, 2023

Admin and coaches will review focused instruction, model think alouds, ask hard questions to ensure the lessons are rigorous and engaging. Admin and coaches will bring focus back to benchmarks and targets to ensure all students receive on grade level instruction.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Pollard (jennifer.pollard@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 15th, 2023

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

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

This area of focus was selected based on a significant increase in the number of referrals form the 22-23 school year. When conducting informal walkthroughs, it was observed that the high amount of new to the field teachers struggled with creating and implementing with fidelity Tier 1 instruction. However, the discipline data did correspond with the racial diversity groups because there was no discrepancy for our underperforming subgroups.

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

We will maintain 80% or more of our Tier 1 for discipline with 0-1 referrals. This expectation will be held for the subgroups of our multiracial students, African American students, and SWD students.

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

The admin team will use Data Dashboard information to monitor monthly. Then steps will occur to ensure we address missing skills through MDT meetings, coaching, and Tier 1 fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@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.)

We will enter our second year of full implementation of PBIS to ensure strong Tier 1 supports.

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

This is a district mandated and approved initiative to support all subgroups and Tier 1 implementation.

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.

Train new teachers on PBIS and provide returning teachers with refresher information. The Dolphin depot will continue to support Tier 1 WAVE expectations, quarterly. Pop up shops will also occur during typically increasing behavior referral times to help motivate students and teachers to continue to meet the WAVE expectations.

Person Responsible: Jannissa Nettles-Brown (jannissa.nettles-brown@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

Scheduling quarterly collaboration days

Person Responsible: Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

Roll out Teaching with Love and Logic Book Study and Training for all instructional personnel. Use data to differentiate who would benefit who needs to complete the training.

Person Responsible: Joy Baxley (joy.baxley@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023 and ongoing

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).

Resources such as district budget, TItle 1 allocations and internal funds are used to purchase people and programs to support student needs. Needs are determined through the completion of our CNA, or Comprehensive Needs Assessment, completed at the end of each year to support planning for the coming year. That is the same document used to write this School Improvement Plan.

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

To implement UFLI in grades K-2 with fidelity.

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

To work to ensure that instruction and tasks are aligned to the benchmarks and reach the depth of the standard.

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

If we implement UFLI with fidelity, then at least 50% of student in grades K-2 will show they are on track to pass the statewide assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If we align the instruction and task to the benchmarks, then we will show a 5% increase in the number of students who are on track to pass the statewide assessment.

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.

UFLI fidelity checks will be completed for grades K-2 by administrators and CAS's regularly, and data tracked through progress monitoring. Classroom walkthrough data and data analysis for grades 3-5 will be used to determine how task and instructional alignment is impacting student achievement for FAST 2 and 3.

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

Baxley, Joy, joy.baxley@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?

We will use UFLI, a phonics program designed and researched by the University if Florida with a strong basis of evidence, and supported by the district as it aligns with our Reading Plan as well as to the BEST Standards. We will monitor grades K-2 through the use of fidelity checks and regular classroom walkthroughs. We know that aligning instruction and tasks to the benchmark in grades 3-5 will assist in achieving our outcome, and aligns with the Reading Plan and is evidence based since it one of the options in SIP! . This will be monitored through our collaborative planning process for ELA each Tuesday as well as through the collection of data during classroom walkthroughs.

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 district selected this program to address the phonics deficiency and we have seen a record of effectiveness last year as we used the program for the first time. We selected the task and instructional alignment to benchmarks because we are making this a part of our overall SIP goal. We believe that if we can address the depth of the standard with sufficient rigor, the impact on student achievement will be great.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership
- ◦ Literacy Coaching
- ◦ Assessment
- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers in K-2 new to UFLI will receive professional learning; the Literacy Coach and Literacy Leadership (admin team) will do regular fidelity check and coaching as needed. Assessments throughout the year will be given and the data analyzed to evaluate progress.	Swinehart, Charlotte, charlotte.swinehart@marion.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coach and Leadership (Admin) will attend and support weekly collaborative planning for ELA to maintain the focus on aligning the instruction and tasks to the benchmarks. They will use classroom walkthroughs to gather date on the delivery of instruction and tasks to be aligned with the benchmark with sufficient rigor.	Pollard, Jennifer, jennifer.pollard@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.

Notification of the location of our SIP plan is on our website (marionschools.net/hve) and goes home in a flyer in both English and Spanish, and parents are also informed at our Annual Title 1 meetings. SAC is also made aware, so that is how Business Partners are made aware. Areas of Focus are shared with faculty and staff and reviewed throughout the year. Skylert messages in both languages also go out to inform our school community,

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))

We build and maintain these relationships beginning the minute folks come through the door, even during the summer. Orientation and Open House events also welcome our families, and provide needed resources such as free books. Throughout the year, Strong Fathers, Strong Families Math and Science nights bring families together to work on math and science activities that can be replicated at home. Holly Jolly Reading night and Academic Conference Team meetings on Early Release days also support this building of positive relationships for student success. Our Family Engagement Liaison works with individual families who may need food, clothes, or other supports. The PFEP can be found at marionschools.net/hve.

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)

We have identified our Bottom Quartile students in Reading and Math, as well as those students who fall into our underperforming subgroups. In addition to strengthening our Collaborative Planning process and focusing on increasing students engagement, we have small group instruction being delivered to these bottom quartile students by our support facilitators and academic coaches, as well as a plan to monitor for fidelity and evaluate for progress. Student placement was carefully tweaked to ensure best access to this support, as well as the best chance for success.

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

Our Family Engagement Liaison and school counselors are trained in these state and local resources, and prepared to share with families as needed. Regular Multidisciplinary Team meetings ensure that we identify students who may be in need of these supports.