

Marion County Public Schools

Marion Elearning



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	8
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Marion Elearning

1614 E FT KING ST BLDG 3, Ocala, FL 34471

www.marion.k12.fl.us/schools.mel

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	38%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	B	C	I*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Marion eLearning is to develop and deliver standards-based, student-centered online courses that increase educational opportunities and 21st century skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is our vision to provide personalized, interactive, and innovative mastery-based virtual education.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
Vowinkel, Paul	Other
Dunning, Christi	School Counselor

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The instructional leaders are responsible for setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, evaluating teachers, promotes growth in student learning, meets with staff members on a regular basis, work together to problem solve, set high expectations for performance, create a culture for continuous learning, modeling effective instruction, support collaboration, and give praise for effective teaching.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected

Friday 10/12/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students exhibiting two or more indicators		

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA Achievement and Math Achievement both declined. There is a slight trend from SY17 to SY18. However the amount of students scoring a level 1 has decreased during the same time period.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math Achievement showed the biggest decline.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Math Achievement showed the biggest gap when compared to the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

While none of our components showed a gain our ELA was the lowest decline.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

N/A

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	46%	56%	67%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	44%	55%	62%	49%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	37%	48%	0%	47%	46%
Math Achievement	38%	49%	62%	39%	48%	58%
Math Learning Gains	20%	46%	59%	31%	47%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	35%	47%	0%	40%	46%
Science Achievement	50%	51%	55%	0%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	6 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	0%	46%	-46%	57%	-57%
	2017	0%	50%	-50%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	0%	43%	-43%	56%	-56%
	2017	70%	52%	18%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-70%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018	60%	46%	14%	55%	5%
	2017	60%	47%	13%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	0%	48%	-48%	62%	-62%
	2017	0%	48%	-48%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	0%	47%	-47%	62%	-62%
	2017	80%	55%	25%	64%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-80%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018	30%	50%	-20%	61%	-31%
	2017	30%	45%	-15%	57%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	50%	49%	1%	55%	-5%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	64	50		36	10						
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
WHT	65	58		65	50						

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title	Parent Understanding and Support of Curriculum
Rationale	Providing additional support to parents so that they truly understand the state standards guided curriculum.
Intended Outcome	Parents will be empowered to take a lesson and truly deliver that lesson and curriculum to the student in a home environment.
Point Person	Paul Vowinkel (paul.vowinkel@marion.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description	Provide 4 opportunities throughout the school year where parents will have the opportunity meet and work with teachers to dig deeper into the curriculum.
Person Responsible	Paul Vowinkel (paul.vowinkel@marion.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	School leadership as well as both teachers will take part in these sessions.
Person Responsible	Paul Vowinkel (paul.vowinkel@marion.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2

Title Students will be able to participate in online interactive activities in a safe manner.

Rationale Students will comply with online learning rules and have an understanding of the rules and the consequences of operating outside of those parameters.

Intended Outcome Giving our very youngest students a better understanding of what cyber bullying looks like and how it can be avoided and how it will not be tolerated. Also, monitoring the online interactive activities allowing for a safe learning atmosphere.

Point Person Paul Vowinkel (paul.vowinkel@marion.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description Teachers and administrators will review acceptable forms of electronic communication and online course etiquette and expectations with students during orientations. Working closely with parents to ensure student online safety.

Person Responsible Paul Vowinkel (paul.vowinkel@marion.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Orientation attendance rosters and welcome call communication logs will be reviewed for fidelity. Monitor courses and teacher communication logs for evidence of cyber-bullying; investigate reported instances of cyber-bullying as needed. Educating parents on how to monitor student online safety.

Person Responsible Paul Vowinkel (paul.vowinkel@marion.k12.fl.us)