Marion County Public Schools

Fordham Early Learning Academy School



2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
	40
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Fordham Early Learning Academy

4000 W ANTHONY ROAD, Ocala, FL 33475

[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.

At Fordham Early Learning Academy, we work to provide a warm, safe, and developmentally appropriate environment for young learners to grow and thrive academically.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together, we exist to cultivate our youngest learners' academic success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Neveils, Vickie	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through his/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.
Beck, Jennifer	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school. He/She works with stakeholders to develop a shared vision and mission for the school. He/She guides and works with the leadership team to analyze student data to monitor student progress to drive instruction and provide curriculum resources aligned to the Florida standards. The principal also develops a program that promotes professional development based on evaluations and feedback to retain an effective/highly effective staff; and to build relationships with parents and the community.
Carpenter, Marsha	School Counselor	The school counselor supports social-emotional learning, provides experiences for students to explore career development; and helps students to problemsolve and cope effectively to become productive citizens within our community. The school counselor also supports students by monitoring attendance concerns.
Martine, Amy	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

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 school leadership team works with teachers and staff to develop the school improvement plan. Families from the School Advisory Council provide input during the development process, and the plan is frequently reviewed at established meetings.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly reviewed using student progress monitoring data to ensure effective implementation. The school leadership team will review data results following each assessment period, and student achievement should increase, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. When data results are not upwardly trending, revisions to the plan will be made to ensure continuous improvement.

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	Elementary School
(per MSID File)	PK-2
Primary Service Type	K 12 Conord Education
(per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification	
*updated as of 3/11/2024	
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)	
School Grades History	
*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
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								
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total	
Absent 10% or more days	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator			(Grad	de L	evel				Total
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TOLAT
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		

Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment

Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.

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

	Indicator	Grade Level	Total
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Students with two or more indicators

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator Grade Level	Total
-----------------------	-------

Retained Students: Current Year

Students retained two or more times

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									
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total				
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					

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

Indicator			(Grad	de L	evel				Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component		2023			2022		2021				
Accountability Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State		
ELA Achievement*		44	53		46	56					
ELA Learning Gains											
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile											
Math Achievement*		50	59		50	50					
Math Learning Gains											
Math Lowest 25th Percentile											
Science Achievement*		46	54		53	59					
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64					
Middle School Acceleration					49	52					
Graduation Rate					41	50					
College and Career Acceleration						80					
ELP Progress		57	59								

^{*} 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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index								
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No							
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target								
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index								
Total Components for the Federal Index								
Percent Tested								
Graduation Rate								

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

		2022-23 ES	SA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMAF	RY
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

	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													
ELL													
AMI													
ASN													
BLK													
HSP													

	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%									
MUL													
PAC													
WHT													
FRL													

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													
SWD													
ELL													
AMI													
ASN													
BLK													
HSP													
MUL													
PAC													
WHT													
FRL													

	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														
SWD														
ELL														
AMI														
ASN														

	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		
BLK														
HSP														
MUL														
PAC														
WHT														
FRL														

	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														
SWD														
ELL														
AMI														
ASN														
BLK														
HSP														
MUL														
PAC														
WHT														
FRL														

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.

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.

Based on the data, student attendance prior to compulsory school age is an area of lower performance. Contributing factors may include limited transportation options to the school and a lack of family focus on attendance prior to compulsory school age.

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

Fordham Early Learning Academy opened in August 2022.

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.

N/A

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

Star Early Literacy in Kindergarten-Weekly collaborative planning focused on reading and math instruction was instrumental in increasing Kindergarten test scores across assessment periods,

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

One area of potential concern is attendance below 90%.

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

- 1. Maintaining student attendance above 90%
- 2. Increasing STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, and Star Math scores in kindergarten and 1st grade

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 early warning system data for the 2022-2023 school year, 29% of preschool students below compulsory school age struggled to regularly attend school, with 10 of 35 students absent 10% or more days.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, there will be a 10% reduction in the number of incoming students in Kindergarten and 1st grade who are absent 10% or more days, as measured by daily district attendance data.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance will be monitored weekly by the school counselor using Skyward attendance reports. Monthly, the school counselor will discuss students with attendance concerns at school leadership meetings to problem-solve attendance concerns.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marsha Carpenter (marsha.carpenter@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.)

High Expectations for Students (1.44 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching) refers to students' expectations for and beliefs in themselves. This involves students predicting or self-reporting grades, making learning intentions and success criteria transparent, having high but appropriate expectations, and providing feedback at the appropriate levels to build confidence in taking on challenging tasks

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As students are in attendance, they are more able to self-regulate their learning and master the content being presented. When not in attendance, learning in the classroom continues, and mastery of the content by the student is questioned.

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 school counselor will implement a school-wide attendance campaign that will be communicated via the school newsletter and morning show, targeting all students and families.

Person Responsible: Marsha Carpenter (marsha.carpenter@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023 and throughout the year as needed.

The school counselor will monitor Tier I attendance concerns and refer those students of further concern to the social worker for Tier 2/3 support. The school counselor will implement an attendance incentive system for students and work closely with families to remove attendance barriers.

Person Responsible: Marsha Carpenter (marsha.carpenter@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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.

Incoming Kindergarten and 1st-grade students from Fordham Early Learning Academy demonstrated an increase in Star Early Literacy from AP1 to AP3 for the 2022-2023 school year. For AP3, 94% of incoming Kindergarten students scored at or above the 40th percentile on the Star Early Literacy Assessment, which was five percent higher than the district average. For AP3, 82% of incoming 1st-grade students scored at or above the 40th percentile on Star Early Literacy and Math, which was 23% higher than the district average in early literacy and 22% higher than the district average in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we provide teachers with professional learning and collaborative planning in the Science of Reading and effective math strategies, then the percentage of proficient students in K and 1st grade as measured by the STAR Early Literacy, Reading, and Math Assessment will maintain at 85%, respectively.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will be conducted in August, January, and May. The August and January results will drive targeted monitoring plans for students not meeting the proficiency levels.

Periodic ELA/math assessments supported by both SAVVAS core series will be assigned to students throughout the year to monitor content mastery and determine needed remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Beck (jennifer.beck@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.)

SAVVAS Core Reading and SAVVAS Core Math will provide Tier I instruction. Our support facilitator will address the mastery of the content by implementing Tier 2/3 strategies, track progress, and remediate as needed following weekly collaboration sessions.

Ongoing progress monitoring will occur utilizing STAR assessments three times a year for comparative data. School-based formative assessments will monitor mastery of benchmarks. Internal program formative checks of district-approved intervention programs will periodically monitor MTSS progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Formative assessments (.90 Effect Size on Hattie's Index of Teaching)

This includes using formative assessments to improve student outcomes and enable teachers to see what is happening for each student in their classroom as a result of their instruction.

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?

Nο

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 reading and math core Tier I in all classrooms with the assistance of the support facilitator within inclusion classrooms.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Beck (jennifer.beck@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year

All teachers, including the support facilitator, will participate in weekly collaborative ELA/math sessions to build the capacity of BEST standards, formative assessments, and instructional strategies to support all tiers of instruction.

Person Responsible: Amy Martine (amy.martin@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year

Monitor formative data to adjust instruction/ interventions as needed **Person Responsible:** Amy Martine (amy.martin@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the 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).

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

The SIP and SWP will be discussed with families at the annual Title I meeting held on September 12, 2023. The SIP and SWP will be shared and disseminated at the first School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting on September 21, 2023. Progress will be discussed routinely at scheduled SAC meetings throughout the year. The SIP will be made publicly available on the school website at https://www.marionschools.net/Domain/22.

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))

Fordham Early Learning is dedicated to building positive relationships with families and community stakeholders. The Family Engagement Plan will be shared and disseminated at the first School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting on September 21, 2023. The plan will be discussed routinely at scheduled SAC meetings throughout the year. The Family Engagement Plan will be made publicly available on the school website at https://maronschools.net/Domain/22. Families will kept informed of their child's progress through regular and ongoing communication from the classroom teacher and school. This includes digital, phone, and in-person communication.

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))

Fordham Early Learning Academy is committed to building an academic program that maximizes quality learning time while providing an enriched and accelerated curriculum. The school master schedule outlines specific and dedicated periods for each core subject. The master schedule also incorporates a specific time each day for students to receive accelerated curriculum opportunities to support their learning. Weekly collaboration opportunities between the leadership team and instructional staff provide ongoing opportunities for planning and implementing standards-based lessons.

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

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

Fordham Early Learning Academy assists preschool children in the transition from our early childhood program to other local elementary school programs by ensuring they are prepared for Kindergarten through intentional and systemic instruction of the Florida Early Learning and Developmental Standards (FELDS). Additionally, Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) students at Fordham visit Kindergarten classrooms at the end of the year and learn from current Kindergarten students what to expect for the upcoming school year. As Fordham grows to include 2nd grade, the school will ensure opportunities to visit a neighboring elementary program are incorporated into the program as students transition to neighboring schools for 3rd-5th grade.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

•	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
	•	Total:	\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes