Marion Oaks Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Marion Oaks Elementary School

280 MARION OAKS TRL, Ocala, FL 34473

[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.

The mission at Marion Oaks Elementary School is to create a nurturing and inclusive environment where students can discover their unique potential, embrace creativity, and develop essential skills. The school is committed to fostering a love for learning, empowering students to become lifelong learners and preparing them to thrive as responsible, compassionate, and engaged global citizens. Together, we build a strong foundation for success in academics, character, and personal growth, ensuring every child's journey at Marion Oaks Elementary School is filled with joy and excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Marion Oaks Elementary School is to nurture compassionate, confident, and forward-thinking individuals who will make a positive impact on society and lead with integrity and empathy.

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
Dreher, Lisa	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school. She works with stakeholders to develop a common vision and mission for the school. She guides and works with the leadership team to analyze student data in order to monitor student progress to drive instruction and provide curriculum resources aligned to the Florida standards; develops a program that promotes professional development based on evaluations and feedback in order to retain an effective/highly effective staff; and build relationships with parents and the community.
Loera, Hazel	School Counselor	The school counselor provides support for social emotional learning; provides experiences for students to explore career development; helps students to problem solve and cope effectively to be become productive citizens within our community. The school counselor also supports students by monitoring attendance concerns.
Ashberger, Kelly	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through her expertise in curriculum and analyzing student data to drive decision making for instruction. The assistant principal also supports the teachers by using evaluations and observations to determine staff needs in professional development and instructional support through mentoring, modeling, and coaching.
Soto, Nancy	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through her expertise in curriculum and analyzing student data to drive decision making for instruction. The assistant principal also supports the teachers by using evaluations and observations to determine staff needs in professional development and instructional support through mentoring, modeling, and coaching.
McNulty, Jason	Dean	The student service manager works with the principal primarily to develop guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies as well as procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning. He maintains visibility and accessibility on the school campus and at school-related activities and events during work day. He also works together with the school counselor to support students with problem solving and coping effectively to be become productive citizens within our community.
Irvin, Robin	School Counselor	The school counselor provides support for social emotional learning; provides experiences for students to explore career development; helps students to problem solve and cope effectively to be become productive citizens within our community. The school counselor also supports students by monitoring attendance concerns.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brazill, Emily	Dean	The student service manager works with the principal primarily to develop guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies as well as procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning. He maintains visibility and accessibility on the school campus and at school-related activities and events during work day. He also works together with the school counselor to support students with problem solving and coping effectively to be become productive citizens within our community.
Goenaga, Isabel	Math Coach	The content area specialist for mathematics provides expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff; uses leading/lagging student data and/or staff surveys to provide professional development opportunities; and/or supports students by modeling instructional strategies.
Pietryka, Sylvia	Reading Coach	The content area specialist for ELA provides expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff; uses leading/lagging student data and/or staff surveys to provide professional development opportunities; and/or supports students by modeling instructional strategies.
Gomes, Lourdes	Parent Engagement Liaison	The Family Engagement Liaison will support their school-site with fostering partnerships between the school and families to create and sustain student and school improvement. They will work alongside key stakeholders to design family engagement opportunities allowing families to learn and apply concepts and new skills. The goal is to establish and improve effective communication between home and school and improve parent and family outreach.
Strait, Amy	Other	The Multi-Tiered System for Support Coach is responsible for providing targeted instructional support and interventions to students who require additional academic assistance. The MTSS coach also trains teachers on all intervention programs, monitors fidelity, and interprets both lagging and leading data to ensure students are in the appropriate intervention program. The coach collaborates with classroom teachers as well as administration to ensure students' academic needs are being met.

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.

Involving stakeholders, families, and businesses in the school improvement plan process is essential for fostering collaboration and creating a comprehensive plan that addresses various needs and concerns. The process at Marion Oaks Elementary School for this is as follows. First all relevant stakeholders are identified which includes parents, teachers, students, administration, as well as community and business partners. Next, surveys are administered, and meetings are held to gather input from all stakeholders. The data collected from those are then analyzed to identify common needs, concerns and priorities. Once that has been done then a plan is drafted based on school needs and feedback. The plan is shared with the School Advisory Committee for final approval or revisions if needed. Once approved then the plan is implemented throughout the school year, used to allocate resources and progress monitored on a regular basis.

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))

Monitoring the school improvement plan is crucial for ensuring its effective implementation and measuring its impact on increasing student achievement. The plan is monitored on regular basis for both implementation and continuous improvement through a variety of ways. Regular data collection is essential to monitor the plan's progress. This includes academic performance data, teacher and staff feedback, faculty and staff surveys and other relevant data as needed. All stakeholders are engaged in monitoring the process including parents, students, administration as well as community and business partners. Based on data and feedback, adjustments can be made in the plan to ensure all students are on track for success as well as offer relevant professional development to faculty and staff as needed.

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	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	35	52	64	56	41	47	0	0	0	295
One or more suspensions	167	132	47	106	95	176	0	0	0	723
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	6	21	38	16	5	23	0	0	0	109
Course failure in Math	5	16	23	13	7	47	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	75	49	50	0	0	0	174
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	63	64	46	0	0	0	173
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	25	41	47	55	94	114	0	0	0	376

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	31	50	70	39	42	0	0	0	0	232

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	1	2	25	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	62	41	52	48	40	53	0	0	0	296
One or more suspensions	10	4	7	7	10	15	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	25	35	75	36	10	34	0	0	0	215
Course failure in Math	24	20	55	18	14	57	0	0	0	188
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	51	51	61	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	58	48	62	0	0	0	168
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	4	7	15	48	62	0	0	0	141

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	27	31	61	26	14	46	0	0	0	205

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	10
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	62	41	52	48	40	53	0	0	0	296
One or more suspensions	10	4	7	7	10	15	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	25	35	75	36	10	34	0	0	0	215
Course failure in Math	24	20	55	18	14	57	0	0	0	188
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	51	51	61	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	58	48	62	0	0	0	168
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	4	7	15	48	62	0	0	0	141

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	27	31	61	26	14	46	0	0	0	205

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33	44	53	42	46	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				56			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			40		
Math Achievement*	41	50	59	44	50	50	40		
Math Learning Gains				52			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			23		
Science Achievement*	34	46	54	32	53	59	36		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					49	52			
Graduation Rate					41	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	57	59	47			44		

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	191
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
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	26	Yes	4	1
ELL	28	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	35	Yes	2	
MUL	22	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	41			

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	36	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL	39	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	33			41			34					60
SWD	15			20			20				5	64
ELL	23			25			29				5	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			25			24				4	
HSP	27			40			32				5	59
MUL	24			34			20				4	

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	42			52			44				4	
FRL	31			39			32				5	58

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	42	56	44	44	52	44	32					47
SWD	22	45	43	17	40	39	15					32
ELL	18	36	44	29	38	29	9					47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	63	46	39	50	36	30					
HSP	35	49	45	38	46	33	24					47
MUL	30	45		35	45							
PAC												
WHT	55	66	40	54	60	75	45					
FRL	38	54	44	39	51	45	27					46

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	39	45	40	40	30	23	36					44
SWD	22	24	26	21	16	21	18					33
ELL	29	35	18	33	26	15	34					44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	58		33	16		35					
HSP	36	42	20	39	30	19	32					44
MUL	24			24								
PAC												
WHT	46	46		44	39		40					
FRL	35	43	35	36	32	20	33					42

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	42%	49%	-7%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	48%	-7%	58%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	22%	39%	-17%	50%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	48%	-6%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	53%	-16%	61%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	32%	43%	-11%	51%	-19%

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.

Third grade students show the lowest performance in reading as measured by FAST in 2023. Twenty-two percent of third graders were proficient which equates to seventy-eight percent of Marion Oaks third graders were nonproficient. Sixty-three percent of third grade teachers were new to Marion Oaks Elementary School which could have been a contributing factor to the decline in proficiency. In addition to new teachers that were required to learn the relatively new benchmarks, many students entered the grade level with previous learning gaps that also contributed to the decline in proficiency. Tier 1 instruction continues to be an area that needs improvement across grade levels. During collaboration content area specialists and administration will work closely with teachers to design standard based activities that will be used to enhance tier 1 instruction.

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

Third grade reading proficiency dropped eighteen percent thus showing the greatest decline from the previous year. Sixty-three percent of third grade teachers were new to Marion Oaks Elementary School which could have been a contributing factor to the decline in proficiency. In addition to new teachers that were required to learn the relatively new benchmarks, many students entered the grade level with previous learning gaps that also contributed to the decline in proficiency. Tier 1 instruction continues to be an area that needs improvement across grade levels. During collaboration content area specialists and administration will work closely with teachers to design standard based activities that will be used to enhance tier 1 instruction.

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.

Third grade reading proficiency had the greatest gap when compared to the state. Twenty-two percent of third graders at Marion Oaks Elementary School were proficient whereas the state average amongst third graders was fifty percent. Several factors could have contributed to this drop such as new teachers to the grade level, relatively new benchmarks, and previous learning gaps.

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

Fifth grade reading and math proficiency increased from 2022 to 2023. Fifth grade reading proficiency gained four points from 2022-2023 going from 38% proficient to 42% proficient; while math increased from 42% in 2022 to 49% proficient in 2023. The fifth-grade team is comprised of veteran teachers who knew the benchmarks, grade level expectations, as well as grade level content. During collaboration teachers planned rigorous on grade level lessons and were able to differentiate student instruction based on classroom data.

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

There is still a definite disconnect between student proficiency and course failures. Professional development is still needed to ensure that accurate grades are given, and grades reflect what a student can independently accomplish. The number of office discipline referrals have increased. Professional development will continue to be offered as well as clear expectations for students. School-wide attendance is still an area of concern.

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

a. Increase student reading proficiency
b. Increase student math proficiency
c. Decrease number of office discipline referrals
d. Increase student attendance

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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 assessment data Students with Disabilities and ELL students need additional support in order to increase student proficiency. In order to increase proficiency Marion Oaks Elementary School will focus on, strong tier 1 instruction, increasing student engagement and goal setting in order to increase student proficiency in these subgroups. Additional supports are offered to all subgroups below 41% such as before and afterschool tutoring, additional in class support such as remediation, additional time and support with instructional and non-instructional faculty/staff and additional goal and data tracking to monitor success.

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

Marion Oaks Elementary School will increase student engagement in order to increase learning gains therefore overall school proficiency will increase by 7% going from 38% to 45%. Individual subgroups that fall below the 41% threshold will increase by at least 5% in overall proficiency.

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

Teachers and students will meet regularly to track and measure goals. This will increase student engagement as students take ownership for their progress. During weekly collaboration teachers will identify trends in student data. Administration will monitor student goals and objectives through weekly collaborative discussions with teachers. During classroom walkthroughs administration will engage in student dialogue based on student data folders. Teachers will also set specific goals for their class as well as expected growth for each student. Teachers will track student as well as overall classroom data. Administration will hold regular data conversations in order to monitor progress and offer resources when needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@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.)

In addition to goal setting and student data trackers, teachers will work collaboratively each week to plan activities that will increase student engagement for all students in all core subjects. In addition to providing teachers with opportunities to collaborate and to plan highly engaging activities for students, Marion Oaks Elementary school's Family Engagement Liaison and Content Area Specialists will also work with parents in order to provide parent trainings and events that will increase student engagement at home and at school.

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

Setting goals is essential for several reasons such as motivation, focus and prioritization, measurable progress and sets both short- and long-term vision for students and teachers. Goal setting empowers students and teachers to take control of their educational progress, develop skills, and realize their full potential.

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.

In addition to providing teachers with opportunities to collaborate and to plan highly engaging activities for students for all students with targeted activities and lesson for students with disabilities and English Language Learners, Marion Oaks Elementary school's Home School Liaison and Content Area Specialists will also work with parents in order to provide parent trainings and events that will increase student engagement at home and at school.

Person Responsible: Kelly Ashberger (kelly.ashberger@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

Reading is an ongoing area of focus at Marion Oaks Elementary School. Historical trends in data reflect that student reading proficiency continues to lag behind both the district and the state. Reading is the primary focus because it is the foundation for acquiring knowledge across various subjects and disciplines.

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

Marion Oaks Elementary School will focus on planning, aligning, and delivering rigorous Tier 1 instruction in all content areas thus proficiency in ELA will increase by 7% as measured by the 2023-2024 state assessments.

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

Weekly classroom walkthroughs will be conducted and data collected, district and state assessment data (such as progress monitoring, F.A.ST. will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will utilize well-planned checks for understandings and other formative data to plan and provide small group instruction. Instructional coaches will provide targeted support during collaboration on Tier 1 instruction, task alignment and check for understanding. The administrative team will facilitate regularly scheduled data chats with teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@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.)

Professional development on student achievement (.51 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies). Marion Oaks Elementary School will offer professional development that will focus on increasing student differentiation through small group instruction. Teachers will also receive professional development on disseminating data to drive and plan for small group instruction. Through collaboration and professional development opportunities teachers will learn how to implement strategies that will provide rigorous Tier 1 instruction, differentiation, and small group instruction. Teachers will plan higher order questions and check for understandings during collaboration two times per week for all content areas.

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

Research shows that if teachers receive sufficient and ongoing professional development to deliver rigorous Tier 1 core instruction then students receiving the instruction will show outcomes that indicates a greater level of proficiency.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Professional development will be provided to all instructional and classroom paraprofessionals on reading strategies and small group implementation which will have a direct impact on all content areas. Collaborative planning will take place two times per week in order to plan for tier 1 instruction, differentiation, and small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Sylvia Pietryka (sylvia.pietryka@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Teacher retention and recruitment are critical aspects of maintaining a strong and effective educational system at Marion Oaks Elementary School. It provides continuity and stability, quality of education, mentorship and support as well as overall positive school culture.

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

To increase teacher retention at Marion Oaks Elementary School, administration will offer mentor programs, professional development opportunities, create a positive school culture, and offer multiple opportunities for collaboration.

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

Monitoring the desired outcomes of teacher retention is essential to assess the effectiveness of the retainment strategies. Ongoing conversations, support and surveys will be utilized. Attendance at professional development opportunities will be taken to ensure teachers are present to benefit from the strategies that are offered. Coaching and mentoring opportunities will be offered based on teacher specific needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@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.)

Evidence based strategies will be ongoing professional development, coaching and mentoring as well as collaboration with peers and academic coaches on a regular basis.

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

Academic coaching, mentoring and collaboration play a crucial role in the retention of teachers. They provide individualized support, which helps to address specific academic challenges. These strategies build confidence through regular interactions and support which leads to long-term academic success and the cultivation of strong relationships.

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.

Ensuring teacher retention involves assigning teacher mentors, providing ongoing professional development as well as giving teachers the opportunity to collaborate with peers on a regular basis. New

teacher meetings will be held twice per month, collaboration with peers a minimum of two times per week, and professional development will take place during preplanning, early release days and as needed.

Person Responsible: Nancy Soto (nancy.soto@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

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

To review funding and allocate resources based on needs the following steps will occur. Identify specific needs and priorities, this will include reviewing existing data and conducting surveys. Define clear objectives and goals for the allocation of resources will be established. These objectives will be aligned to identified needs and will be measurable as set forth in the School Improvement Plan. The school will then complete a budget analysis to review and determine what resources are needed in order to increase student proficiency. Finally, a comprehensive plan for resource allocation will be developed and closely monitored for continued improvement and effectiveness.

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 Early Learning indicators as measured by the state assessment 50% of kindergarten students were proficient in ELA at the end of the final progress monitoring window, while 45% of first graders were proficient and 44% of second graders were proficient. Therefore, 50% of kindergartners, 55% of first graders and 56% of second graders were not proficient as measured by STAR reading at the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

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

According to FAST data 22% of third graders, 40% of fourth graders, and 42% of 5th graders were proficient at the end of the third progress monitoring window; however, 88% of third graders, 60% of

fourth graders and 58% of fifth graders were not proficient as measured by FAST ELA at the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

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

According Early Learning indicators as measured by the state assessment 50% of kindergarten students were proficient in ELA at the end of the final progress monitoring window, while 45% of first graders were proficient and 44% of second graders were proficient. Therefore, 50% of kindergartners, 55% of first graders and 56% of second graders were not proficient as measured by STAR reading at the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

If students in K-2 receive explicit, systematic foundational reading skills instruction, then the number of proficient students at each grade level will increase by 10%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to FAST data 22% of third graders, 40% of fourth graders, and 42% of 5th graders were proficient at the end of the third progress monitoring window; however, 88% of third graders, 60% of fourth graders and 58% of fifth graders were not proficient as measured by FAST ELA at the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

If students in grades 3-5 receive standards-aligned instruction using grade-level text, small group instruction and intense Tier 1 instruction then the number of students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2024 statewide, standardized ELA assessment will increase 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.

Dreher, Lisa, lisa.dreher@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 will implement a coaching cycle to support reading instruction based on observational classroom data and results of progress monitoring from state, district, and classroom data. Additional support will be given to all new teachers to Marion Oaks Elementary School through mentoring, coaching and professional development.	Pietryka, Sylvia, sylvia.pietryka@marion.k12.fl.us
Teachers will be provided targeted professional development on small group strategies, intense Tier 1 instruction and data analysis. Teacher will set classroom goals that will be monitored by teacher and administration. Teachers will facilitate goal setting for students; this is a crucial process for academic growth. Teachers will train students on creating academic SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound) goals. Data meetings will be held after each progress monitoring window to determine if students are on track to meet the get goal; if not then adjustments will be made to their goals as well as school-wide action plan.	Dreher, Lisa, lisa.dreher@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.

Involving stakeholders, families, and businesses in the school improvement plan process is essential for fostering collaboration and creating a comprehensive plan that addresses various needs and concerns. The process at Marion Oaks Elementary School for this is as follows. First all relevant stakeholders are identified which includes parents, teachers, students, administration, as well as community and business partners. Next, surveys are administered, and meetings are held to gather input from all stakeholders.

The data collected from those are then analyzed to identify common needs, concerns and priorities. Once that has been done then a plan is drafted based on school needs and feedback. The plan is shared with the School Advisory Committee for final approval or revisions if needed. Once approved then the plan is implemented throughout the school year, used to allocate resources and progress monitored on a regular basis. The plan is then shared with all stakeholders and implemented and updated as needed. The SIP is also posted on the school website at https://www.marionschools.net/moe as well as available on request for print.

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))

Building positive relationships with parents is crucial for fulfilling a school's mission and keeping them informed. Some strategies that Marion Oaks Elementary School will use are regular communication through newsletters, Skylerts, emails, parent teacher conferences as well as hosting parent engagement activities throughout the school year. Marion Oaks Elementary School will create a welcoming and open atmosphere where parents feel comfortable sharing their feedback and concerns. Finally, the school will utilize technology and social media (Twitter) to keep families informed about school events, updates and their child's progress. The Parent and Family Engagement Plan is also posted on the school website at https://www.marionschools.net/moe as well as available on request for print.

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))

To strengthen the academic program, increase quality learning time, and provide an enriched curriculum Marion Oaks Elementary School will continuously review and update curriculum to ensure it aligns to current state benchmark/expectations, Tier instruction to meet the needs of individual learners, and offer professional development for faculty and staff to improve instructional strategies and keep up with the latest educational research. By implementing these strategies Marion Oaks Elementary can create a more robust academic program, increase quality learning, and provide enriched curriculum, leading to improved student outcomes and a more fulfilling educational experience.

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

N/A