

Marion County Public Schools

# Maplewood 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>10</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>14</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>23</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>26</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

## Maplewood Elementary School

4751 SE 24TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[ no web address on file ]

### SIP Authority

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

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

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Maplewood is a school where all children can learn and develop to their fullest potential. Each student's success is based upon the school, home, and community working side by side to ensure that each child will become a life-long learner and develop a sense of self worth.

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

Side By Side For Success

### 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   |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Carter, Chrissy | Principal           | Mrs. Carter provides the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The principal supervises all administrative, instructional, and non-instructional personnel assigned to the school. |
| Martin, James   | Assistant Principal | Mr. Martin is responsible for curriculum and distributing resources to teachers. He also assists with professional development of teachers and paraprofessionals. He is the assessment coordinator for state testing. He also assists with professional development of teachers and paraprofessionals.  |
| Smiley, Carmen  | Assistant Principal | Dr. Smiley is responsible for curriculum and distributing resources to teachers. She also assists with professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals. She assists the testing coordinator with all state assessments.   |
| Jones, Caren    | Instructional Coach | Mrs. Jones serves as the Reading CAS at Maplewood. She provides professional learning for all teachers in the area of ELA. She also attends collaborative planning to help support teachers with Tier I instruction in ELA, specifically helping them align instruction to grade level benchmarks.  |

### 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 SIP is a live document that is examined throughout the year with all stakeholders. Teachers, parents, business partners, and community members review the plan during back to school meetings, SAC meetings, our annual Title I night, and after testing throughout the year. Stakeholder input is welcomed and additions are made to the plan throughout the year as needed.

### 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 is monitored throughout the year, especially after data is available to measure academic standards. After progress monitoring assessments, the SIP will be reviewed to measure growth toward goals. If adjustments need to be made, these will be discussed with stakeholders during SAC meetings, and collaborative planning meetings and added or changed accordingly. The process used will consist of reviewing SIP goals and using district and state assessment data (DPMAs, BA, F.A.S.T) to determine a starting point in August. Each month, during data meetings, the leadership team will meet with teachers to measure proficiency levels in each grade level to determine the progress being made toward each goal. Additionally, subgroups will be identified and monitored separately from school-wide data to ensure goals for those groups are being monitored.

### Demographic Data

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 48%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 99%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | TSI   |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)*<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT) |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*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   | 15          | 41 | 37 | 39 | 32 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 196 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 4  | 5  | 13 | 7  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42  |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 15          | 13 | 29 | 18 | 6  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 7           | 3  | 22 | 12 | 7  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 42 | 20 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 18 | 24 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 21          | 27 | 43 | 42 | 20 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 184 |       |

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 | 33          | 31 | 36 | 35 | 32 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189   |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20    |
| 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   | 34          | 40 | 33 | 34 | 39 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 2           | 3  | 1  | 9  | 5  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 37          | 56 | 71 | 20 | 13 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 59 | 64 | 21 | 15 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 33 | 21 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 37 | 18 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 30 | 3  | 37 | 18 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |       |

**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 | 37          | 52 | 62 | 23 | 13 | 28 | 52 | 62 | 23 | 352   |

**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 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |

**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   | 34          | 40 | 33 | 34 | 39 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 2           | 3  | 1  | 9  | 5  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 37          | 56 | 71 | 20 | 13 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 59 | 64 | 21 | 15 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 33 | 21 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 37 | 18 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 30 | 3  | 37 | 18 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |       |

**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 | 37          | 52 | 62 | 23 | 13 | 28 | 52 | 62 | 23 | 352   |

**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 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |

**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*                | 46     | 44       | 53    | 49     | 46       | 56    | 48     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 47     |          |       | 56     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 31     |          |       | 39     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 59     | 50       | 59    | 62     | 50       | 50    | 64     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 59     |          |       | 56     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 28     |          |       | 38     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 51     | 46       | 54    | 52     | 53       | 59    | 48     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 62       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 49       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 41       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 68     | 57       | 59    | 50     |          |       | 67     |          |       |

*\* 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)               | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 55  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 2   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 273 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 5   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 47  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 2   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 378 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| SWD           | 25                              | Yes                | 4   | 4   |
| ELL           | 50                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI           |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN           |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK           | 30                              | Yes                | 2   | 1   |
| HSP           | 51                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL           | 50                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC           |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT           | 59                              |                    |   |   |

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| FRL                  | 50                                     |                           |  |  |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD                  | 28                                     | Yes                       | 3  | 3  |
| ELL                  | 54                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                  |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                  |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                  | 33                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |
| HSP                  | 53                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                  | 68                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                  |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                  | 50                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                  | 44                                     |                           |  |  |

**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**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students     | 46              |               |                    | 59               |                |                     | 51              |                |                  |                          |                                | 68                  |
| SWD              | 16              |               |                    | 31               |                |                     | 21              |                |                  |                          | 5                              | 40                  |
| ELL              | 36              |               |                    | 45               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          | 3                              | 68                  |
| AMI              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ASN              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| BLK              | 26              |               |                    | 39               |                |                     | 23              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |
| HSP              | 39              |               |                    | 60               |                |                     | 53              |                |                  |                          | 5                              | 70                  |
| MUL              | 57              |               |                    | 43               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          | 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       | 53       |        |             | 66        |         |              | 59       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| FRL       | 39       |        |             | 55        |         |              | 42       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 68           |

## 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 | 49       | 47     | 31          | 62        | 59      | 28           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     | 50           |
| SWD          | 22       | 32     | 23          | 29        | 36      | 19           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL          | 41       | 70     |             | 53        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 50           |
| AMI          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK          | 31       | 31     | 19          | 40        | 52      | 30           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP          | 42       | 56     |             | 54        | 67      |              | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL          | 71       |        |             | 64        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT          | 55       | 49     | 37          | 72        | 59      | 18           | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL          | 42       | 48     | 34          | 51        | 59      | 31           | 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 | 48       | 56     | 39          | 64        | 56      | 38           | 48       |         |           |                   |                     | 67           |
| SWD          | 19       | 26     | 32          | 33        | 34      | 32           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL          | 53       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 67           |
| AMI          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK          | 29       | 41     | 30          | 45        | 35      | 36           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP          | 48       | 50     |             | 55        | 65      |              | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL          | 77       |        |             | 62        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC          |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT          | 51       | 65     | 50          | 73        | 60      | 29           | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL          | 43       | 43     | 33          | 56        | 52      | 50           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 50%    | 49%      | 1%                         | 54%   | -4%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 56%    | 48%      | 8%                         | 58%   | -2%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 47%    | 39%      | 8%                         | 50%   | -3%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 56%    | 48%      | 8%                         | 59%   | -3%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 79%    | 53%      | 26%                        | 61%   | 18%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 61%    | 50%      | 11%                        | 55%   | 6%                      |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 52%    | 43%      | 9%                         | 51%   | 1%                      |

### 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.**

F.A.S.T. data for PM 3 shows that proficiency is lowest in third grade ELA at 47%. Contributing factors include a deficit in phonics skills for readers, a lack of professional learning for new teachers, new benchmarks, textbooks and curriculum. This year, as the state adopted new benchmarks, the county adopted new curriculum for classrooms and there were a lot of major changes without proper training for implementation.

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

Proficiency in students with disabilities showed a decline from the previous year. This is partially due to the number of students in self-contained classes growing. This is also due to students not having the time needed in one school year to close the gap between mastering grade level standards and becoming proficient. Students with disabilities did not participate in after school tutoring opportunities as often as their general education peers. This was due to behavior issues, lack of transportation, and lack of certified, trained 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.**

Fifth grade ELA scores have the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Factors contributing to this gap could be lower proficiency in previous grade levels that are compounded by the time the child reaches fifth. Trends at the school indicate that ELA proficiency in reading is below the state in each grade level. Related factors could include the district adopting new curriculum to teach the new state benchmarks and a lack of training provided to all teachers on successful implementation of instructional resources.

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

Math data indicate that more than half of our school is proficient in math. We are higher than both district and state averages at 64 percent. I believe this is because we focus on the basics of understanding numbers and operations school-wide which is the premise for how math builds upon itself throughout the grade level benchmarks. Each week in collaborative planning, our math CAS meets with teachers and provides ideas for remediation and extensions for learning. The CAS focuses on going back to basics and reminding teachers that math builds upon itself.

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

An area of concern for Maplewood is proficiency in students with disabilities. Our data indicate that this has been a subgroup that has not performed to proficiency for many years in a row now. Factors contributing to this deficit include a shortage of teachers which result in larger class sizes, new teachers that do not have proper training, teachers without ESE certification, and students with significant behaviors which impede their academic learning.

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

ELA proficiency is our highest priority for all students.  
Students with Disabilities achieving learning gains is a high priority.

### **Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Progress monitoring of the the F.A.S.T. indicates that proficiency in ELA is 60% in Kindergarten, in first grade, in second grade, 47% in third grade, 55% in fourth grade, and 50% in fifth grade. Third grade proficiency is especially low this year which indicates a needed focus that should start in lower grades to ensure when students enter third grade, they are appropriately prepared. Implementing effective small group instruction in all classrooms will help teachers analyze student mastery on an individual level and allow teachers a better understanding of what prerequisite skills are needed to accelerate learning. If effective small group instruction is implemented school-wide, then ELA proficiency should improve from 50-53% as measured by the F.A.S.T.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Maplewood will increase proficiency in ELA in third, fourth, and fifth grade. Third grade proficiency in ELA will increase from 47% to 50% in third grade, from 55%-58% in fourth grade, and from 50% to 53% in fifth grade as measured by the F.A.S.T.

**Monitoring:**

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

Small group instruction in ELA will be monitored throughout the year by classroom walkthroughs to determine the rigor of instruction and guide professional learning. Hattie's Index of teaching of direct instruction with an effect size of .59 will ensure that the teacher specifies learning outcomes, the teacher knows and communicates success criteria, builds commitment and engagement in learning, designs lessons with a check of understanding, guided practice, closure and independent practice in small group instruction. Student data will be analyzed weekly to determine interventions and next steps. Student progress monitoring meetings will be scheduled regularly to address individual student needs. The following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:

PreK-5th F.A.S.T

3rd-5th DPMA (District Progress Monitoring Assessments)

3rd- 5th BA (Benchmark Assessments)

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Chrissy Carter (christine.carter@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.)

Small group instruction focused on grade level benchmarks will result in student achievement. This year, Maplewood will continue to focus on student task alignment to the benchmark.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction allows teachers to work one on one or in small groups with students that have similar needs. Instruction can be tailored to remediate students as needed while monitoring mastery of current standards. Hattie's effect size indicates that this strategy has a great impact on student learning.

**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.

Professional Learning will be provided on effective small group instruction, as well as effective instruction of ELA benchmarks. Collaborative planning will focus on ELA direct instruction and planning for instructional tasks aligned with standards. Progress will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, and constructive feedback to ensure the reading block is being implemented appropriately with fidelity.

**Person Responsible:** Caren Jones (caren.jones2@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Professional Learning will be ongoing. It will begin in August and continue throughout the year, making changes in response to teacher needs/feedback.

Students with disabilities will participate in intensive small group instruction as well as an appropriate intervention that matches their deficiency and is delivered by a certified teacher. This subgroup will be monitored throughout the year to determine the effectiveness of the intervention and track progress monitoring.

**Person Responsible:** Chrissy Carter (christine.carter@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** This will begin in August and continue throughout the year.

**#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.

Based on input from parent surveys, parents would like more information on assisting their students with academics at home. This is how Maplewood identified providing resources, training, and learning opportunities for parents as a critical need. According to the National Coalition for Parent Involvement, research indicates that regardless of student income, or background, students with involved parents are more likely to have higher grades and test scores, attend school regularly, have better social skills, show improved behavior, and adapt well to school. Maplewood wants to create an environment that encourages learning, and communicates high yet reasonable expectations for each child's achievement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Maplewood will involve parents in their child's education, and will give parents resources, strategies and share data to help their students at home which will increase proficiency in both ELA and Math by 3%. Proficiency in reading will increase from 50% to 53% and 64% to 67% in math as measured by the 2024 F.A.S.T.

**Monitoring:**

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

The effectiveness of parent engagement events and trainings will be monitored through parent surveys and conversations with stakeholders. Student data will be monitored to track the academic progress of students and evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Chrissy Carter (christine.carter@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.)

Family engagement and involvement events will be planned to teach families ways to assist students with academics at home.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Parent engagement is crucial for student success. Engaging families in academics and building a home-school relationship is key to student success.

**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.

Based on parent survey feedback, family engagement and involvement activities will be planned based on family needs. These events will be offered both face to face and virtually (when possible) and will be advertised through notes home, the school marquee, and SKYLERT messages and newsletters.

**Person Responsible:** Chrissy Carter (christine.carter@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Engagement activities began in July with a visit to a local neighborhood to provide families with supplies. Several events are on the calendar, being advertised and in the process of planning.

**#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.

Maplewood's subgroup of Black/African Americans received 33% of federal index points toward ELA proficiency. This is significantly lower than the school's overall percentage points of all students. This data indicates a need to focus on this subgroup of students to begin raising proficiency in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By providing students in the subgroup of Black/African American will intensive small group instruction, students will raise their ELA proficiency by 9%. This means that ELA proficiency will improve from 33%-42%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Data from this subgroup will be monitored individually in addition to being monitored in the total school population. Teachers will identify students from this subgroup and monitor their scores to design individual remediation lessons when needed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Chrissy Carter (christine.carter@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.)

Small group instruction focused on grade level benchmarks will result in higher student proficiency for each subgroup. This year, we will continue to focus on student task alignment to the benchmark.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction allows teachers to work one on one or in small groups with students that have similar needs. Instruction can be tailored to remediate students as needed while monitoring mastery of current standards. Hattie's effect size indicates that this strategy has a great impact on student learning.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students in the Black/African American subgroup will participate in intensive small group instruction as well as an appropriate intervention that matches their deficiency and is delivered by a certified teacher. This subgroup will be monitored throughout the year to determine the effectiveness of the intervention and track progress monitoring. Additionally, when planning after school tutoring, this subgroup will be targeted to attend.

**Person Responsible:** Chrissy Carter (christine.carter@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** This will begin in collaborative planning in August as we identify students that fit in this subgroup. Monitoring will continue all year as data is available.

**#4. 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.

Maplewood's subgroup of Students with Disabilities received 28% of federal index points toward ELA proficiency. This is significantly lower than the school's overall percentage points of all students. This data indicates a need to focus on this subgroup of students to begin raising proficiency in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By providing students in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities with intensive small group instruction, students will raise their ELA proficiency by 5%. This would mean ELA would improve from 28%-33%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Data from this subgroup will be monitored individually in addition to being monitored in the total school population. Teachers will identify students from this subgroup and monitor their scores to design individual remediation lessons when needed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Martin (james.martin@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.)

Small group instruction allows teachers to work one on one or in small groups with students that have similar needs. Instruction can be tailored to remediate students as needed while monitoring mastery of current benchmarks. Hattie's effect size indicates that this strategy has a great impact on student learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction focused on grade level benchmarks will result in higher student proficiency for each subgroup. This year, we will continue to focus on student task alignment to the benchmark.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup will participate in intensive small group instruction as well as an appropriate intervention that matches their deficiency and is delivered by a certified teacher. This subgroup will be monitored throughout the year to determine the effectiveness of instruction and interventions and to track progress being made.

**Person Responsible:** James Martin (james.martin@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Data from this subgroup will be monitored individually. Teachers will identify students in their class from this subgroup, monitor their scores and design individual remediation lessons when needed.

### **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)).

School improvement funding allocations are reviewed by the leadership team, teachers, community members and stakeholders. The allocation amount is shared at SAC meetings and teacher meetings. The team uses data analysis such as student performance, district and state assessments, and survey feedback to make decisions. Additionally the team refers to the Comprehensive Needs Assessment to ensure decisions being made are based on need. Teachers and staff offer input on resources, supplies and/or programs and supplemental curriculum material needed to support learning for all students. In addition, these stakeholders provide insight into options for family engagement activities and resources needed to support families at home with their student's learning.

### **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**

Small group instruction focused on grade level benchmarks will result in higher student achievement and proficiency in ELA. This year, we will focus on student task alignment to the benchmark. Based on the 2022-2023 end of year F.A.S.T. data, 44 percent of second grade students were proficient in ELA. This was the only grade level from kindergarten through second grade that did not meet at least 50 percent proficiency. Small group instruction is an instructional practice that is proven to increase learning outcomes for students. During small group instruction, teachers can focus on accelerating learning and providing individualized scaffolding for students needing support. This practice was selected as a critical need school-wide because it allows true differentiation for all students in ELA.

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

Small group instruction focused on grade level benchmarks will result in higher student achievement and proficiency in ELA. This year, we will focus on student task alignment to the benchmark. Based on the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. scores, 47 percent of third grade students were proficient in ELA. This was the only grade level in between third through fifth grade that did not meet at least 50 percent proficiency. Small group instruction is an instructional practice that is proven to increase learning outcomes for students. During small group instruction, teachers can focus on accelerating learning and providing individualized scaffolding for students needing support. This practice was selected as a critical need school-wide because it allows true differentiation for all students in ELA.

### 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

During the 2022-2023 school year, 60 percent of Kindergarten students, 60 percent of first grade students, and 44% of second grade students ended the year proficient in ELA as measured by F.A.S.T. Our goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to have at least 51 percent of all students in kindergarten, first, and second grade proficient in ELA as measure by F.A.S.T.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

During the 2022-2023 school year, 47 percent of third grade students, 56 percent of fourth grade students, and 50 percent of fifth grade students ended the year proficient in ELA as measured by F.A.S.T. Our goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to have at least 51 percent of all students in third, fourth, and fifth grade proficient in ELA as measure by F.A.S.T.

### 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.

Small group instruction in ELA will be monitored throughout the year by classroom walkthroughs to determine the rigor of instruction and guide professional learning. Hattie's Index of teaching of direct instruction with an effect size of .59 will ensure that the teacher specifies learning outcomes, the teacher knows and communicates success criteria, builds commitment and engagement in learning, designs lessons with a check for understanding, provides guided practice, closure and independent practice in small group instruction. Additionally, student data will be analyzed weekly to determine interventions and next steps. Student progress monitoring meetings will be scheduled regularly to address individual student needs. The following assessments will be used to monitor student progress.

Pre-K through fifth: F.A.S.T.

K-5: F.A.S.T.,

3-5: Benchmark Assessments, District Progress Monitoring Assessments



**Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Carter, Chrissy, christine.carter@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?

Small group instruction focused on grade level benchmarks will result in student achievement. This year, we will focus on student task alignment to the benchmark. Small group instruction meets Florida's definition of an evidence-based practice as well as supports the Marion County K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan. Small group instruction allows for scaffolding which has an effect size of .82 On Hattie's Effect Sizes related to student achievement.

**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?

Small group instruction allows teachers to work one on one or in small groups with students that have similar needs. Instruction can be tailored to remediate students as needed while monitoring mastery of current benchmarks. Small group instruction supports the identified need of growth in ELA proficiency because research indicates scaffolding has an effect size of .82 on Hattie's Effect Sizes related to student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring                     |
|---|---|
| Literacy coaching will be provided throughout the year through scaffolded professional learning on effective small group instruction. Collaborative planning will focus on ELA direct instruction and planning for instructional tasks aligned with benchmarks. Progress will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, and constructive feedback to ensure the reading block is being implemented effectively and with fidelity. District and state assessments will be used to monitor student learning and adjust professional learning needs. | Jones, Caren,<br>caren.jones2@marion.k12.fl.us        |
| Student assessment data will be used to determine the effectiveness of professional learning and small group instruction implementation.  | Carter, Chrissy,<br>christine.carter@marion.k12.fl.us |

## Title I Requirements

### Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**

List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP and budget is disseminated to parents, staff, and stakeholders at our Annual Title I meeting as well as at faculty meetings and SAC meetings. The process and rationale for the SIP is explained to all stakeholders. It is explained what data is used to create goals and how subgroups are considered and defined. Throughout the year, the SIP is referred to at SAC meetings. Administrators share progress toward each goal written by sharing outcomes of academic testing, as well as surveys from family engagement events. Additionally, information regarding the budget and any resources/supplies purchased are shared at these meetings in addition to how the budget is specifically helping students achieve academically. After tutoring concludes, information regarding the effectiveness of tutoring is shared with staff and stakeholders by comparing pre and post tests. The SIP is made public on the school website at <https://www.marionschools.net/mwe>.

**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))

Maplewood works hard to build strong, 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. The Family Engagement Liaison meets regularly with staff members to educate them on the importance of family engagement as well as ways to promote partnerships with families. The Family Engagement Liaison is visible in classrooms, at community events, and even makes home visits. The leadership team meets regularly with the Family Engagement Liaison to elicit input regarding

what families want/need to build positive relationships, support the needs of students, and provide families with resources needed for student success. Positive relationships are built by seeking input from parents regarding what their students need and then providing activities, events, and training that support those needs. The Parent Family Engagement Plan is made public on the school website at <https://www.marionschools.net/mwe>.

**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))**

Maplewood plans on strengthening the academic program for all students by focusing on small group instruction in ELA school-wide. This focus will include professional learning on targeted benchmark aligned instruction to small groups and individual students. Providing quality instruction will enhance the learning time in the classroom. Students mastering grade level benchmarks will be given opportunities for enrichment through purchased resources and materials.

**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))**

This plan is developed in accordance with state law, as well as federal, state, and district guidelines. The SIP is supported under ESSA and the school participates in the free lunch program. Students transitioning from Pre-K to Kindergarten have the opportunity to attend a summer "Kindergarten Kickstart" program where they come to school for four days and learn routines/procedures for their Kindergarten school year. Students in fifth grade that are self-contained have IEP articulation meetings where principals from surrounding schools attend to discuss the best placement for the child. All general education fifth grade students have the opportunity to attend a middle school field trip before the end of their fifth grade year. This field trip allows them to tour the middle school, meet students, staff members, and ask questions. Maplewood also advertises and shares information regarding the District Parent Resource room available to all families free of charge.