

Marion County Public Schools

Marion Elearning



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	10
Title I Requirements	12
Budget to Support Goals	13

Marion Elearning

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

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

Demographics

Principal: Paul Vowinkle

Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: I (%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	10
Title I Requirements	12
Budget to Support Goals	13

Marion Elearning

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

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

School Demographics

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

School Grades History

	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Year				
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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vowinkel, Paul	Other	
Dunning, Christi	School Counselor	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/9/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	0	6
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Prior Year - 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	6	0	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	47%	57%	70%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	56%	58%	60%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	53%	0%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	51%	63%	61%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	58%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	51%	0%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	47%	53%	0%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
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	0 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (6)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019					
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	57%	-57%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	45%	-45%	56%	-56%
	2018	60%	46%	14%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-60%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	62%	-62%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	45%	-45%	60%	-60%
	2018	30%	50%	-20%	61%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-30%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	44%	-44%	53%	-53%
	2018	50%	49%	1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-50%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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						

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

N/A

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

N/A

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?

N/A

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The administration would like to continue to support the learning coaches(parent/guardian) in better understanding the curriculum.
 The administration would like to continue support student safety in the online environment.

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

1. Online Student Safety
2. Parent understanding of curriculum
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Parent Understanding and Support of Curriculum
Rationale	Providing additional support to parents so that they truly understand the state standards guided curriculum
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If parents are empowered to assist lessons and truly understand the standards of the lesson and curriculum to help the students in a home environment then student scores will increase by 5% as measured by FSA or equivalent state assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paul Vowinkel (paul.vowinkel@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ongoing research shows that family engagement in schools improves student achievement, reduces absenteeism, and restores parents' confidence in their children's education.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students with involved parents or other caregivers earn higher grades and test scores, have better social skills, and show improved behavior.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide 4 opportunities throughout the school year where parents will have the opportunity to meet and work with teachers, and dig deeper into the curriculum and aligned standards. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Paul Vowinkel (paul.vowinkel@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Students will be able to participate in online interactive activities in a safe environment.
Rationale	Students will comply with online learning rules and have an understanding of the rules and the consequences of operating outside of those parameters.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we give our youngest students a better understanding of what cyber bullying looks like, how it can be avoided and how it will not be tolerated, then students will have a safe learning atmosphere with online schooling measured by monitoring the online interactive activities. and school attendance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paul Vowinkel (paul.vowinkel@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	School safety is linked to improved student and school outcomes. In particular, emotional and physical safety in school are related to academic performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students who are victims of physical or emotional harassment are at risk for poor attendance, course failure and dropout.
Action Step	
	1. Teachers and administrators will review acceptable forms of electronic communication and online course etiquette and expectations with students during orientations and on campus activities.
Description	2. Work with parents to ensure student online safety. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Christi Dunning (christi.dunning@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

N/A

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

N/A

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Parent Understanding and Support of Curriculum	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students will be able to participate in online interactive activities in a safe environment.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00