

Marion County Public Schools

# College Park 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>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</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>27</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>28</b>

## College Park Elementary School

1330 SW 33RD AVE, Ocala, FL 34474

[ 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 College Park Elementary School is to inspire students to become successful citizens in their community.

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

Our vision at College Park Elementary School is to positively impact the future by creating lifelong learners with the community in mind.

### 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
Forsyth, Teresa	Principal	The principal coordinates administrative oversight and plans all phases of instructional leadership, including educational programs, staff evaluation, office administration, budgetary planning, discipline, professional development, and counseling services. Ensures a productive learning environment through continual collaboration with teachers, students, parents, and community partners.
Bryant, Charnee	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the school site principal, assumes responsibilities in the administration of school curriculum, instructional programs, staff development, guidance and evaluation of staff, state and district testing procedures, and general administrative functions. The assistant principal facilitates grade-level collaboration and team meetings, parent conferences, and campus event planning.
Winkler, Rebekah	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the school site principal, assumes responsibilities in the administration of school curriculum, instructional programs, staff development, guidance and evaluation of staff, state and district testing procedures, and general administrative functions. The assistant principal facilitates grade-level collaboration and team meetings, parent conferences, and campus event planning.
Durrance, Ashley	Reading Coach	The Reading Instructional Coach will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective literacy instruction. In order to fulfill these expectations, the Instructional Coach will provide personalized support that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers in support of the school improvement action plan.
Yates, Austin	Math Coach	The Math and Science Instructional Coach will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective mathematics and science instruction. In order to fulfill these expectations, the Instructional Coach will provide personalized support that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers in support of the school improvement action plan.

### 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.

To involve stakeholders such as school staff, families and students, surveys were provided pertaining to school climate, the learning environment and instructional practices. Input from the above mentioned surveys, business partner face-to-face meetings, The Community Partnership School and the School Advisory Committee was used to identify goals for which to develop strategic plans that directly connect to the feedback of all stakeholders to enhance student academic success and family and community engagement as identified in the SIP.

### SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards through various modes of assessment. Both, reading and math goals will be monitored after each testing cycle of Benchmark Assessments (BA), District Progress Monitoring Assessments (DPMA) and the state progress monitoring system assessments. There will also be progress monitoring through administrative observation of targeted tasks as identified during collaboration reading intervention progress monitoring with assigned programs and small group instruction using Envision Math resources that will include classroom progress monitoring. All progress monitoring will culminate with performance on AP3 Fast and Star testing.

### Demographic Data

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	83%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C



	2018-19: C 2017-18: D
<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	46	55	50	44	41	43	0	0	0	279	
One or more suspensions	1	4	5	15	6	6	0	0	0	37	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	23	6	14	0	0	0	43	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	38	14	7	0	0	0	59	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	62	54	34	0	0	0	150	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	55	38	0	0	0	122	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	36	23	53	104	101	0	0	0	317	

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	1	4	5	41	33	36	0	0	0	120

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	0	38	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

### Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	63	44	53	52	39	48	0	0	0	299	
One or more suspensions	24	15	10	20	17	25	0	0	0	111	
Course failure in ELA	22	52	37	39	14	46	0	0	0	210	
Course failure in Math	23	37	31	46	17	26	0	0	0	180	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	62	38	47	0	0	0	147	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	42	38	50	0	0	0	130	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	

**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	33	44	39	44	17	38	0	0	0	215

**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	63	44	53	52	39	48	0	0	0	299	
One or more suspensions	24	15	10	20	17	25	0	0	0	111	
Course failure in ELA	22	52	37	39	14	46	0	0	0	210	
Course failure in Math	23	37	31	46	17	26	0	0	0	180	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	62	38	47	0	0	0	147	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	42	38	50	0	0	0	130	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	

**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	33	44	39	44	17	38	0	0	0	215

**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*	37			40	47	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				52	56	61	55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49	51	52	70		
Math Achievement*	47			54	54	60	49		
Math Learning Gains				50	62	64	57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42	52	55	63		
Science Achievement*	42			27	42	51	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	65			57			56		

\* 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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	226
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
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	24	Yes	4	4
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	4	
HSP	47			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	37	Yes	1	

**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	44			

**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	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	3	
HSP	47			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	41			

**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	37			47			42					65
SWD	10			22			19				5	57
ELL	35			49			43				5	65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			35			43				4	
HSP	38			56			40				5	66
MUL	47			56							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			31			41				4	
FRL	35			46			40				5	62

## 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	40	52	49	54	50	42	27					57
SWD	4	34	50	21	39	35	0					31
ELL	39	56	52	51	51	38	18					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	44	38	46	49	43	18					
HSP	44	53	50	59	47	42	25					56
MUL	33	40		53	50							
PAC												
WHT	37	70		49	61		50					
FRL	33	45	42	49	46	40	20					53

## 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	40	55	70	49	57	63	29					56
SWD	6	31		20	57	70						27
ELL	34	58	100	48	63	82	21					56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	61		43	36		17					
HSP	42	54	76	52	63	73	33					56
MUL	18			36								
PAC												
WHT	43	53		55	67		33					
FRL	37	53	65	45	54	61	24					55

**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	54%	49%	5%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	48%	-17%	58%	-27%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	39%	-8%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	60%	48%	12%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	53%	-16%	61%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	43%	-4%	51%	-12%

### 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.**

According to Spring 2023 Fast ELA data, in grades 3-5 only 38% of the students are performing at grade level proficiency. 64% of our 3-5 students represent the African American, Students with Disabilities and ELL population. Only an average of 21% of these students are scoring at a level of proficiency. This indicates that there is disconnect in the implementation of instructional practices and strategies for meeting the needs of our largest and most vulnerable populations. Although professional development is being provided, there has been a disconnect from shifting theory to practice. Trends that were noticed in the class was that there was not strategic implementation of the curriculum through the use of high impact strategies, such as strategic questioning for engaging students in dialogue, providing multiple ways for students to respond or interact with the tasks and providing effective and timely feedback. It is

important that students interact with text on a deeper level in classroom through discussion and intentional use of student learning tasks.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from 2022 to 2023 was in the area of math. Overall proficiency declined from 54% of students being proficient to 38% of all students in grade 3-5 being proficient. There was the implementation of new BEST benchmarks and a new curriculum, which were two very impactful factors. This year skills shifted from being taught in grades either below or above the grade that they were taught during the 2021-2022. This created a learning gap for students entering their 2022-2023 school year and a major undertaking for teachers to teach the current year's grade level benchmarks, along with the skills that would have been taught in the previous year, according to the new benchmarks. It is also important to note that some of these shifts in skills within the benchmark, not only shifted by one grade, but some shifted by two grades. Although this not a significant decline, it is noteworthy since it was the area in which we had recently exceeded our record high since 2015.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The data component with the greatest gap was 4th grade ELA proficiency based on 2023 Spring FAST data. College Park lagged behind the state by 27%. Factors that contributed to this gap was the use of lessons that lacked rigor and instruction to the depth of the benchmark. An area of high concern for this grade level is being intentional in the use of a passage and purposeful in the development and use of high level questioning. Students need to be able to go beyond basic recall of the text and be able to identify implicit details to explain, compare and contrast, summarize the text that they are interacting with. Teachers must be aware of the natural progression of a benchmark to be able to build from the low level of complexity to the depth of the concept being taught.

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

5th grade science had the data that showed the greatest improvement. This year's 5th grade group improved by 14 %, which was a greater improvement from last year to this year in comparison to both the district and the state. This increase in percent of students proficient from 2022 to 2023 placed our school within 4% of the district. The actions taken to impact these results was a focus on strategic introduction of content specific vocabulary and inquiry-based tasks that reached to the depth of the standard and connected the abstract concepts through hands-on exposure and discussion. With the supplemental use of spiraled reviews, students were able to consistently revisit concepts previously taught and receive exposure to those that had not been taught to make for ease of access when it was time to teach the concept.

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

1. Attendance
2. ESSA groups, specifically African American Students and Students with Disabilities

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

1. Building Teacher Capacity
2. Delivery of Tier 1 Instruction
3. Data-driven decisions for small group instruction
4. Writing
5. Continued Implementation of UFLI for grade K-2



**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

Due to the high minority population of College Park, it is crucial to develop a culture and support system that is all inclusive and show cases the value of each individual. Research shows that when people (teachers, students, parents, community partners and all other stakeholders) feel valued they will work harder toward supporting the vision of an organization as well as their own goals for success. At College Park Elementary the school staff, families, volunteers, and our Community Partnership School will work together to promote a safe environment and positive school culture. School staff will promote a positive learning environment with the third year of implementation of the Caring School Community Curriculum Resiliency traits and the continuation of our PBIS program. A committee of school staff volunteers, parents, and community workers will contribute to our multicultural events in September and February celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month and Black History Month. The school administrative team along with a committee of staff volunteers promotes a positive culture by recognizing school staff throughout the year as well as promoting themed days for both staff and students to celebrate learning in a safe environment. The administrative team, teachers, and paraprofessionals will plan and implement parent night events that will build the capacity of caregivers and students to promote a healthy socio-psychological environment and increase intellectual stimulation in the home.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Through implementation of the above strategies we will see learning gains from a minimum of 80% of all students.

**Monitoring:**

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

The results will be measured by the state PM3 FAST ELA and Math, Star Assessments and the state science assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@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.)

Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home. The CPS will also provide support to teachers in additional resources as they identify both staff and student needs during collaborative planning and through parent surveys and interviews.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With there being such deficit in the performance of our three lowest performing ESSA groups African American, Students with Disability and ELL students arming parents with resources and strategies to support their students within the home is key to closing the performance gap. If parents can support their child's learning at home it heightens the possibility, as well as the extent to which the gap can be closed within one school year. This includes the impact that the CPS will have on instructional support.

### **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.

Focus on Resiliency Traits embedded within the Caring School Community Curriculum.

7 Ongoing Events and Programs that highlight various cultures and provide opportunity for community to share in the celebration. Some events provide opportunity for the parents to engage in data-driven conversations to better understand the direction in which the school is going and how to best support their child, which leads to a firm partnership between home and school.

Surveys and Feedback after each event and at the end of the year.

**Person Responsible:** Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** October 20, 2023 March 25, 2023

**#2. 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.

3-5 ELA Proficiency has trended at or below 40% since 2015. The ESSA subgroups for both African American students and Students with Disabilities have trended below 41% for the last three FSA administrations and they both maintained the status for the first FAST administration. According to the federal index, the African American subgroup is currently 24% and the Students with Disabilities is 16%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If teachers use data from school-based interim grade-level assessments and the state progress monitoring system to plan Tier 1 instruction that is anchored in the high impact strategies of questioning and student feedback, the ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase from 38% to 48% on the spring 2024 end of year state assessment. Through implementation of solid tier 1 instruction and strategic use of interim grade-level assessments and state progress monitoring to guide small group instruction, teachers will be able to have a more strategic approach to meeting the specific needs of both African American and Students with Disability. Moving African American students from 38% to 48% proficiency and Students with Disabilities from less than 10% to 20% proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

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

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

\*K-5: State Progress Monitoring System assessments August 2023, January 2024, and May 2024

\*3-5: 2023 FSA Reading AP3 FAST assessment of proficiency

\*K-5 students will participate in appropriate reading interventions that will include progress monitoring within their assigned program.

\*Administrators will monitor the use of questioning in collaborative planning and classroom instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rebekah Winkler (rebekah.winkler@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.)

Teachers will be provided professional development in BEST standards and high impact teaching strategies to include effective questioning in each ELA lesson in order to engage students in dialogue to extend their thinking, to provide multiple ways of responding, and to provide formative feedback that will increase learning.

K-2nd grade teachers will be provided professional learning in teaching foundational skills and students will learn foundational phonics skills in a format that provides multiple opportunities to respond to questioning and immediate corrective feedback that will ultimately improve reading automaticity moving into 3rd grade.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Used effectively, questioning yields immediate feedback on student understanding, supports informal and formative assessment, and captures feedback on the impact of teaching strategies. Hattie measures the general effect size of questioning as 0.46, which is above average and within the zone of desired effects on student learning. Questioning is a flexible tool. It is used to provide feedback to students, to check for understanding, and to quickly assess student progress. Feedback to students and teachers has an effect size of 0.73 (Hattie, 2009).

### **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.

Teachers will plan collaboratively to include effective questioning in each ELA lesson, engaging students in dialogue to extend their thinking, to provide multiple ways of responding, and to provide formative feedback that will increase learning.

K-2nd grade students will participate in daily reading foundational skills lessons through the district adopted UFLI program that will improve reading automaticity moving into 3rd grade.

Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure that vocabulary instruction is consistently administered to fidelity.

Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home which research has demonstrated has an effect size of 0.52. Resources will include support through an on-campus resources center and expanded learning classroom, family language acquisition classes, and additional literacy resources for family use at home.

**Person Responsible:** Rebekah Winkler (rebekah.winkler@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** PM3 Spring FAST and Star state assessments

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****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.

3-5 Math Proficiency was 49% in 2023 which was a 5% decline from 2022.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If learning tasks are developed to the rigor of the BEST benchmark and delivered in a gradual release model, then student achievement in grades 3-5 will regain their momentum and reach 59%.

**Monitoring:**

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

\*K-5 students will participate in small group interventions using Envision math resources that will include classroom progress monitoring.

\*Administrators will monitor student learning tasks and exemplars used in collaborative planning and classroom instruction.

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

\*K-5: State Progress Monitoring System assessments August 2023, January 2024, and May 2024

\*3rd – 5th students will take District Progress Monitoring Assessments (DPMAs) in math.

\*3-5: 2024 FAST Math AP3 FAST assessment of proficiency

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Charnee Bryant (charnee.bryant@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.)

Teachers will plan collaboratively to create lessons with a series of worked examples to scaffold student knowledge, promote rigorous skill acquisition, and incorporate fluency practice and small group instruction. Learning tasks will be developed to the rigor of the benchmark and delivered in a gradual release model.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research demonstrates that worked examples are most effective when the teacher explicitly teaches the steps taken to complete the worked example and when learners use self-explanations to describe the steps to themselves and others. Research also shows that when a cycle of worked examples is used in the classroom it consists of "a problem statement and the appropriate steps to a solution. Typically the three steps include:

introductory phase ("I do"), acquisition/training phase ("We do"), Collaborative phase (You do together), test phase /assess learning ("You do"). This reduces cognitive load for students such that they concentrate on the processes that lead to the correct answer and not just providing an answer. Learning is scaffolded in the I Do/We do/You do together phases and ultimately students will practice independently at the depth of the grade-level standard. The overall impact on student learning is high, measured at 0.57 in Hattie's research.

**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.

Student tasks and practice activities will be created and delivered to the depth of the standard.

Classrooms will be monitored to ensure the fidelity of the student work remains at the level of the standard complexity.

Students will be provided exemplars to increase their understanding of particular skills and to establish standard and benchmark expectations.

Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home which research has demonstrated has an effect size of 0.52. Resources will include support through an on-campus resources center and expanded learning classroom, family language acquisition classes, and additional hands-on mathematic resources for family use at home.

**Person Responsible:** Charnee Bryant (charnee.bryant@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** PM3 Spring FAST and Star state assessments

**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 funds are used to supplement resources in our areas of focus. Recommendations from classroom teachers as well as our leadership team are brought before the School Advisory Council to determine how the funds will be best utilized for the year.

**Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

According to PM 3 Star Early Literacy (K-1) and Reading (2nd grade) that students were assessed on in the Spring of 2023, grade levels of 50% students performing below a level 3 are as follows:

-Second grade 50%

In grades K-2, 38% of the students are scoring at a level 1 or 2 on either the Star Early Literacy (Kindergarten) or Star Reading (first and second grade) PM 3 and are not on track to score a level 3. Of these students, 25% of the students in grades K-2 scored a level 1 and are even less likely to score a level 3 on the statewide standardized assessment. In regard to tracking, all teachers will use formative checks embedded within their daily instructional routines along with classroom assessments from district approved curriculum. These are also students who will most likely receive intervention through MTSS and will be progress monitored through the research-based, district approved program that is determined to be most effective for meeting their individual needs.

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

70% of students in grades 3-5 at College Park scored below a level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. In grades 3-5, 61% of the students are scoring at a level 1 or 2 on the statewide FAST assessment PM3 and are not on track to score a level 3. Of these students, 38% of the students in grades 3-5 scored a level 1 and are even less likely to score a level 3 on the statewide standardized assessment. In regard to tracking, all teachers will use formative checks embedded within their daily instructional routines and district benchmark assessments in grades 3-5. These are also students who will most likely receive intervention through MTSS and will be progress monitored through the research-based, district approved program that is determined to be most effective for meeting their individual needs.



## 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 students in K-2 receive explicit, systematic foundational reading skills instruction, then we will increase the number of students measuring proficient by 10%.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If students in grades 3-5 receive standards-aligned instruction using grade-level text and instructional acceleration strategies, then we will be able to increase the number of students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2024 statewide, standardized ELA assessment by 10%.

## 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.

State Progress Monitoring Assessments and District Benchmark Assessments will be used to monitor progress toward the desired outcome. Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. In addition, administrators will monitor the fidelity of implementation of the Foundational Skills instruction in grades K-2.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Forsyth, Teresa, [teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us](mailto:teresa.forsyth@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?

Students in grades K-2 will use the UFLI Foundation Curriculum to support foundational reading instruction

at the Tier I level. This program is aligned with the science of reading and is supported by Just Read Florida. The instructional materials are aligned with the B.E.S.T. ELA. Standards.

Students in grades 3-5 will use district-created lesson plans to align the adopted instructional resources to the new B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. In collaborative planning, teachers will embed high impact teaching strategies into the ELA lesson plans. Both the curriculum and teaching strategies align with the MCPS Achieve 2026 Strategic Plan.

**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?

K-2: The research based UFLI Foundation Reading Curriculum incorporates direct instruction, multiple exposures and daily feedback in the instructional routine. Direct instruction has an effect size of 0.59, Multiple Exposures has an effect size of 0.71, and Feedback has an effect size of 0.73 (Hattie 2009).

3-5: High Impact Teaching Strategies engaging students in dialogue to extend their thinking, to provide multiple ways of responding, and to provide formative feedback work together to increase learning. Questioning has an effect size of 0.46 and Feedback has an effect size of 0.73 (Hattie 2009).

**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: The literacy content specialist and administrative team implement a coaching cycle to support reading instruction based on observational classroom data and results of progress monitoring from state, district, and classroom data.	Durrance, Ashley, ashley.durrance@marion.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership: A school-based literacy leadership team will meet monthly to discuss the progress of our school's measurable goals.	Forsyth, Teresa, teresa.forsyth@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.

Information for the SIP will be disseminated via the school website at <https://www.marionschools.net/cpe>, in SAC and Title I meetings. Stakeholders will be shared school data results on the 2023 FAST and Star performance via a presentation and a hardcopy of the presentation. They will be shared the school website information for them to go deeper into the specifics of the plan if they so choose. Throughout the year there will be ongoing progress monitoring and dissemination of the plan in the monthly occurring SAC meetings. All resources shared are always in both Spanish and English to ensure that all parents and other stakeholders have an opportunity to clearly understand the information being shared.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school will build a positive relationship with parents, families and other stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students through consistent reminders of the mission and goals in SAC meetings, Annual Title I meeting, Open House, Linking Literacy and Math Night and Academic Conference Nights. All of these events will be opportunities to ensure that everyone is working toward the same goal through data-driven decisions on the direction of which the school is progressing with the implementation of the strategies in place. Parents will also be kept informed of the vision of the school through access to the school's Family Engagement Plan at <https://www.marionschools.net/cpe> and the School Improvement Plan at <https://www.floridacims.org/> and their child's progress with school-wide Academic Nights and additional conferences as requested by the teacher or parent. The work of the Community Partnership School will also be a link between the amazing things that are occurring at

school in concordance with the school's mission and goals and ways that they can support the community in meeting those goals for their child's success at home.

**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)**

Student tasks and practice activities will be created and delivered to the depth of the standard. Classrooms will be monitored to ensure the fidelity of the student work remains at the level of the standard complexity. Students will be provided exemplars to increase their understanding of particular skills and to establish standard and benchmark expectations. Community Partnership Schools will strengthen the school-to-home connection by providing families with additional resources to increase intellectual stimulation in the home which research has demonstrated has an effect size of 0.52. Resources will include support through an on-campus resources center and expanded learning classroom, family language acquisition classes, and additional hands-on mathematics resources for family use at home. This support will directly correlate with providing intentional support to the students in the ESSA groups with targeted and intentional small group instruction.

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

na

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

### Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No