

Greenway Elementary School



Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Greenway Elementary School

207 MIDWAY RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is the mission of Greenway Elementary to inspire all students to become successful citizens in the community by maintaining high expectations for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Greenway Elementary will provide an educational environment where each individual in the school community is valued, respected, and encouraged to be a lifelong learner.

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
McEarchern, Leann	Principal	Oversee Instructional and Non-Instructional personnel Budgets (Federal and District) Crisis Management and School Safety School Advisory Council Title 1 Evaluations for all Employees Student Achievement
Manzanares, Patricia	Assistant Principal	Evaluations, Gradebooks, Evaluations, MTSS/Interventions, Lesson Plans, Collaborative Planning, Scheduling, Assist with district and state administrations, ESOL Designee, Clinic/MERT, Coaching and Modeling
Boland, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Collaborative Planning, Coaching and Modeling, MTSS/Intervention Support, ITD Lead, ELA Support
Fortner, Peggy	Dean	Behavior Management Plans, Oversee PBIS, Head of Safety Committee, Threat Assessments, Safe Schools
Howell, Margaret	School Counselor	PSTs, CSTs, ESOL requirements, Suicide Risk Evals, MTSS/Tier System, ESE, 504s, Student Wellbeing

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 was developed in partnership with the SAC and feedback received from stakeholders which was shared at mid-year and end of year. Feedback was gathered through a survey and aligned with the necessary data supporting areas of need. Additionally, input has been gathered through the year via committee meetings, parent input, leadership team, and district support personnel.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring meetings, leadership meetings, and district data review sessions. The school leadership team will disseminate information regarding the SIP with all school-based stakeholders and at meetings such as SAC and Title 1 events. The school's Professional Learning Plan has been created with the needs of students and staff in mind. The plan is fluid and will be adjusted as data is available and reviewed.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	67%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	23	51	48	52	46	46	0	0	0	266	
One or more suspensions	3	5	16	28	10	11	0	0	0	73	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	13	13	13	3	5	0	0	0	50	
Course failure in Math	3	5	8	9	3	4	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	56	37	29	0	0	0	122	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	46	36	260	0	0	0	342	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	38	48	33	83	0	0	0	0	0	202	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	59	47	48	45	31	49	0	0	0	279	
One or more suspensions	9	4	12	22	17	30	0	0	0	94	
Course failure in ELA	20	30	38	21	10	11	0	0	0	130	
Course failure in Math	18	22	31	28	3	16	0	0	0	118	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	30	48	0	0	0	110	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	29	56	0	0	0	115	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	4	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	19	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	24	27	38	34	14	17	0	0	0	154

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	59	47	48	45	31	49	0	0	0	279	
One or more suspensions	9	4	12	22	17	30	0	0	0	94	
Course failure in ELA	20	30	38	21	10	11	0	0	0	130	
Course failure in Math	18	22	31	28	3	16	0	0	0	118	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	30	48	0	0	0	110	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	29	56	0	0	0	115	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	4	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	19	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	24	27	38	34	14	17	0	0	0	154

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	11
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*	41			44	47	56	36		
ELA Learning Gains				54	56	61	40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49	51	52	24		
Math Achievement*	42			47	54	60	34		
Math Learning Gains				57	62	64	34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57	52	55	30		
Science Achievement*	42			39	42	51	37		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	63			43			54		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	222
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
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	22	Yes	4	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	42			
MUL	39	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	43			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	40	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	50			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	45			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	41			42			42					63
SWD	25			21			18				4	
ELL	36			41			35				5	63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			37			40				4	
HSP	39			43			43				5	59
MUL	44			33							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	48			44			39				4	
FRL	35			39			37				5	57

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	44	54	49	47	57	57	39					43
SWD	25	40	48	30	43	32	18					42
ELL	42	43	25	32	64	71	25					43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	67	73	35	43	33	25					
HSP	45	48	38	46	66	72	40					43
MUL	40	38		48	50							
PAC												
WHT	48	54		54	54		47					
FRL	41	52	43	43	57	59	31					35

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	36	40	24	34	34	30	37					54
SWD	17	29	27	15	21	18	25					62
ELL	23	33		18	15		18					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	21	18	25	33	25	19					
HSP	35	47	25	33	31		36					51
MUL	33			43								
PAC												
WHT	46	48		40	39		57					
FRL	35	36	24	32	31	27	41					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	50%	49%	1%	54%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	48%	2%	58%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	39%	-5%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	41%	48%	-7%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	53%	-7%	61%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	50%	-2%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	43%	-3%	51%	-11%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The Science component showed the lowest performance at 40%. We did increase from 39% (21-22 school year) to 40% (22-23 school year.) The contributing factors for the low performance are that the ELA and Math standards changed and the state tests changed. (FSA to FAST) Teachers spent less instructional time in the area of science due to the stringent demands of the new ELA and Math standards. Greenway is trending up in science scores, but we have room for growth. (2021 35%, 2022 36%, 2023 40%)

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

The Math component showed the greatest decline from the 21-22 school year. We earned a 47% for the 21-22 SY and a 45% for the 22-23 SY. The factors that contributed to the decline were large classes, inexperienced teachers, a change in the Math standards, and a change in state testing. (FSA to FAST)

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 Math component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. (Third grade had a 18% difference, fourth grade had a 15% difference, and fifth grade had a 7% difference from the state.) The factors that contributed to the gap are new state standards and new state tests. The state standards were new to teachers and students. The new math standards were more challenging than the previous state benchmarks. The new math standards were being taught all the way up to the test administration. It was difficult for teachers to teach the remaining math standards and simultaneously review the standards that had already been taught. The new state testing administration went from paper-based to computer-based for the 22-23 school year. Students had a difficult time maneuvering through the computer-based assessments.

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

The ELA component showed the most improvement. (From 44% to 45% proficiency) We used our Collaborative Planning time more efficiently during the 22-23 school year. Teachers were required to bring items to the biweekly meetings. (Lesson plans, resources, etc.)

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

Attendance is an area of concern. 31% of our student population have chronic attendance issues, 22% are nearly Chronic, 12% are trending chronic, and 35% have no attendance issues. If students are not at school, they are not receiving the instruction they need and deserve.

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

Improve reading proficiency in grades 3-5. Improve Math proficiency in grades 3-5. Improve Science proficiency in grade 5.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Based on attendance data, Greenway Elementary has been experiencing an increase in chronic absenteeism. During the 2022-2023 school year, 31% (255 students) of our student body was considered chronically absent. 22% (86 students) of our student body was "nearly" chronically absent. 12% (159 students) are "trending" in the chronically absent category. Therefore there must be a concerted effort to monitor and intervene with those students and their families to ensure that they are receiving the maximum number of instructional minutes to support academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If school stakeholders implement a cohesive attendance response initiative, the number of K-5 students reporting attendance below 90% will decrease from 255 to 204. The leadership team will develop and implement a school-wide attendance plan with tiered support. The attendance plan will be supported by schoolwide expectations, incentives, and increased family involvement.

Monitoring:

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

Daily attendance reports (tardies, absences, early check-outs), individualized attendance intervention plans, and Child Study Team (CST) meetings. The CST meetings will be a collaboration between the Family Engagement Specialist, Social Worker, and School Counselor. The leadership team will develop and implement a schoolwide attendance plan with tiered support. The team will use data to monitor and improve student attendance and provide incentives and support to families.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@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.)

All classroom teachers will implement the Caring Schools Community curriculum with fidelity. High expectations will be shared with students and parents. The Caring School Community curriculum will provide a platform to develop a family-style, safe environment to students to learn and grow. The program promotes an inclusive sense of voice and choice for all students to thrive. Additionally, a cohesive attendance plan will be established and implemented with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Development of high expectations for each student is a 1.44 effect size on Hattie's Index of Teaching. Involving students in the process of setting goals for themselves and their classroom is vital in reaching academic, attendance, and behavior targets.

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.

Provide professional learning opportunities for Instructional and Non-Instructional staff focused on improving student attendance and family engagement. Assuring that the Caring School Community curriculum is implemented with fidelity. Emphasize schoolwide attendance expectations for students and staff. Provide recognition opportunities weekly, monthly, and quarterly. The Family Engagement Specialist, Social Worker, and School Counselor will work together to implement a cohesive attendance plan to support all learners and their family needs. The attendance initiative in tandem with the Caring School Community program will positively impact our entire school body.

Person Responsible: Margaret Howell (margaret.howell@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: The initiatives will be implemented with fidelity by September, 2023 and throughout the 23-24 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Based on state and local assessment schoolwide data, ELA, Math, and Science scores are trending upward. However, our proficiency rates are not above 50% in any category. It is imperative to ensure that students are receiving the small group instruction they need to improve proficiency rates. We have one ESSA sub-group that is performing below 41%. Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) were at a 35% for the 2021-2022 school year. The SWD sub-group will benefit greatly from appropriate, small group instruction to improve proficiency rates.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If teachers implement appropriate, small group instruction, then based on the 2024 data, the following increases in proficiencies will occur:

ELA Increases in Proficiency:

Grade 3 from 34% to 41%

Grade 4 from 50% to 55%

Grade 5 from 50% to 55%

Math Increases in Proficiency:

Grade 3 from 41% to 46%

Grade 4 from 46% to 51%

Grade 5 from 48% to 53%

Science Increase in Proficiency:

Grade 5 from 40% to 45%

Monitoring:

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

District and State assessment / progress monitoring data will be analyzed during collaborative planning sessions each week. The data will determine next steps for intervention and acceleration needs for all students. The Instructional Coaches will routinely monitor/assist with the implementation of small group best practices. The Administration will routinely conduct Instructional walkthroughs and frequently monitor data for timely feedback and response.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@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.)

Implement professional learning to increase the quality and quantity of small group instruction. The professional learning topics will include a focus on small group instructional best practices. Twice weekly collaborative planning sessions will include data-based practices, which will increase the use of research-based strategies in planning and allow for monitoring through observation by administration after planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Professional Development on student achievement (.51 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching rating scale) The Professional learning opportunities will assist in teachers learning about small group best practices to use in their classrooms. The professional learning will include support for short-term and long-term goals.

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.

The Instructional Coaches will facilitate grade level collaborative planning sessions twice weekly. The sessions will be guided by establishing instructional practices specifically related to small group instruction. (Also keeping in mind standards-aligned instruction and Formative assessments)

Person Responsible: Leann McEarchern (leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023 and throughout the 23-24 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The process to review school improvement funding allocations will occur through the School Advisory Council. (SAC) The SAC committee will receive regular updates on student assessment data, student and staff needs, etc. The SAC will determine if funding allocations need to remain in place or be adjusted based on data.

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

We will implement the UFLI Foundations program with fidelity.

In grades K-2, 40% of our students have a substantial reading deficiency. The students are lacking the foundational skills they need to be proficient in reading. The UFLI program is designed to strengthen foundational skills and will close learning gaps for our non-proficient students.

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

We will utilize our weekly collaborative planning sessions to strengthen our Tier 1 instructional practices.

The 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. data showed that only 45% of our students in grades 3-5 are proficient in reading. We know the importance of appropriate Tier 1 instruction. We will work to improve our Tier 1 instructional practices to close the learning gaps for our non-proficient readers.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

If we implement the UFLI Foundations program with fidelity in grades K-2, then we will increase the number of students measuring early, mid, or on grade level by 10%. (As measure by STAR/FAST)

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If we strengthen our Tier 1 instructional practices for grade 3-5, then we will increase the number of proficient students by 10% as measure by state testing. (FAST)

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.

K-2

All assessment data from the UFLI program will be monitored monthly. Fidelity checks will be conducted monthly through binder checks and classroom walkthroughs. Additionally, all data will be discussed at PMP meetings throughout the year. The ongoing monitoring will provide data to drive instructional practices and meet the needs of students.

3-5

Tier 1 instructional practices will be monitored through weekly classroom walkthroughs. We will be looking to see that the instructional practices discussed at collaborative planning transfer to the classroom setting. We will also monitor all state and district assessment data to determine the

effectiveness of the Tier 1 instructional practices. The ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes in a timely, productive manner.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McEarchern, Leann, leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidenced-based program aligns with the district's K-12 Reading Plan and is on the MTSS Placement list.

The evidenced-based instructional practices align to the B.E.S.T. standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidenced-based programs address the areas of student need. UFLI - (Foundational skills, Phonics/Decoding)

The evidenced-based instructional practices address the areas of student need.

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
The Literacy Leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs weekly to assure that the UFLI program is being implemented with fidelity.	
Literacy Coaching will be provided to teachers who require additional support in implementing the UFLI program. (Rebecca Boland, Literacy Coach, will provide the coaching.)	McEarchern, Leann, leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us
Assessment - Data will be reviewed monthly to determine effectiveness and future student need.	
Professional Learning-Teachers will be trained to use the UFLI program with fidelity through district and school-based sessions.	
Strengthening Tier 1 instruction through collaborative planning	
Literacy Leadership - We will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to assure that the instructional practices discussed at collaborative planning are transferring properly to the classroom setting.	
Literacy Coaching - The Literacy Coach, Rebecca Boland, will push-in to classrooms to support struggling teachers with Tier 1 instruction. She will model and provide best-practice solutions.	McEarchern, Leann, leann.mcearchern@marion.k12.fl.us
Assessment - All district and state assessment data will be monitored monthly. The data will be used to drive instruction and set goals for individual students.	
Professional Learning - PL opportunities will be provided by the school and at the district level. The sessions will support teachers to strengthen their tier 1 instructional practices.	

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 School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be disseminated through Greenway's webpage, Title 1 Parent Events, Parent Conferences, and the School Advisory Council.

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))

Greenway is working to build positive relationships through Title 1 Parent Events, Parent conferences, quarterly Family Newsletters, and Skyward notifications.

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))

Greenway plans to strengthen the academic program through implementing the MTSS program with strict fidelity. We will also ensure that our acceleration block is used to build student success through additional intervention or enrichment activities.

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

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

-

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

-

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

-

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

-

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

-