

Marion County Public Schools

College Park Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	11
Budget to Support Goals	13

College Park Elementary School

1330 SW 33RD AVE, Ocala, FL 34474

[no web address on file]

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 PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission at College Park Elementary School is to provide all students with the educational opportunities needed to develop academic skills and character traits necessary for a diverse and global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at College Park Elementary is to provide a quality education in a safe and nurturing environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Forsyth, Teresa	Principal
Robles, Noelle	Assistant Principal
Black, Rebecca	Assistant Principal
Prestipino, Angela	School Counselor
Cook, Tracy	Teacher, K-12
Vostrejs, Mary	Instructional Coach
Boicelli, Christine	Administrative Support
Pfriender, Leah	Instructional Media
Gone, Manvitha	School Counselor

Duties

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

Principal: Oversees all school operations and establishes the collaborative culture of the school and its leadership team. Brings together district, school, and community stakeholders in planning, and implementing the SIP. Evaluates effective instructional practices in the classrooms and creates professional development specific to our school needs.

Assistant Principals: Support instructional vision of the principal, oversee teacher collaborative planning, coordinate scheduling, supervise paraprofessionals, assist guidance department, collect data, monitor MTSS implementation, plan professional development and establish best practices for student growth.

Instructional Coaches: Provide professional development and content support, mentor new and developing teachers, model best practices and facilitate learning walks, communicate instructional goals and outcomes with parents and teachers, work with student intervention groups, and support the instructional vision of the principal.

Guidance Counselors: Facilitate MTSS process, support teachers in meeting social/emotional needs of students, monitor student attendance, communicate with parents and students, assist teachers with academic/behavior referral packets, and support the instructional vision of the principal.

Dean: Supports the instructional vision of the principal, assists teachers to establish consistent classroom procedures, maintains behavior data, and supports student academic and social/emotional growth.

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	33	24	21	21	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	10	9	17	22	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	15	37	17	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	63	60	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196

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	20	19	46	40	37	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222

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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

Date this data was collected

Saturday 8/18/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	1	1	1	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	1	2	3	8	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	5	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	60	52	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

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	1	2	3	8	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	43	32	18	29	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	17	11	7	25	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	32	26	38	21	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	69	47	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183

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	32	37	27	57	33	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	236

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?

Science proficiency as measured by the NGSSS Statewide Science Assessment performed the lowest with only 28% of 5th grade students demonstrating proficiency by scoring a 3 or better in the 2017-2018 school year. This continues a downward trend over the last 2 school years representing a drop of 11% from Spring 2016.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math learning gains in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades, as well as learning gains for the lowest performing 25% of students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades, dropped by a total of 22% as measured by the FSA. This represented a dramatic decrease in math achievement.

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

Fifth grade students performed 36 percent below the state in math proficiency as measure by the Spring FSA Mathematics assessment.

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

Third grade students showed a 4% improvement in ELA proficiency as compared to the previous year, representing a two year trend of improvement of the same amount (4 points) for two years.

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

The use of diagnostic and growth monitoring data helped third grade teachers focus on areas of reading instruction needed to meet Tier I instructional needs.

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	34%	46%	56%	37%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	44%	55%	51%	49%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	37%	48%	59%	47%	46%
Math Achievement	39%	49%	62%	42%	48%	58%
Math Learning Gains	32%	46%	59%	36%	47%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%	35%	47%	38%	40%	46%
Science Achievement	33%	51%	55%	38%	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	33 (1)	24 (1)	21 (1)	21 (2)	10 (2)	22 (5)	131 (12)
One or more suspensions	10 (1)	9 (2)	17 (3)	22 (8)	13 (7)	24 (12)	95 (33)
Course failure in ELA or Math	9 (0)	15 (2)	37 (3)	17 (5)	10 (7)	6 (12)	94 (29)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	63 (60)	60 (52)	73 (31)	196 (143)

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	39%	46%	-7%	57%	-18%
	2017	35%	50%	-15%	58%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	33%	43%	-10%	56%	-23%
	2017	43%	52%	-9%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2018	29%	46%	-17%	55%	-26%
	2017	35%	47%	-12%	53%	-18%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	42%	48%	-6%	62%	-20%
	2017	53%	48%	5%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	44%	47%	-3%	62%	-18%
	2017	50%	55%	-5%	64%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2018	25%	50%	-25%	61%	-36%
	2017	37%	45%	-8%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	28%	49%	-21%	55%	-27%
	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
SWD	17	33	33	27	29	18	20				
ELL	24	41	45	37	27	20	10				
BLK	27	47	31	29	26	28	26				
HSP	36	40	35	40	34	22	31				
MUL	10			30							
WHT	46	54	70	53	35		43				
FRL	32	43	41	38	31	23	28				
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
SWD	7	40	46	22	38	43	24				

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
ELL	24	38	52	45	47	55	13				
BLK	31	59	57	43	48	53	11				
HSP	39	48	54	53	55	54	42				
MUL	45	65		36	47						
WHT	40	48		55	55	30	53				
FRL	33	46	53	46	49	47	31				

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	Standards-Based Curriculum: If teachers implement effective standards-based instruction in ELA, math, and science, as well as engage families in support of learning, then student proficiency and learning gains will increase.
Rationale	A downward trend in student achievement in ELA, math, and science, as well as a significant drop in learning gains in both ELA and math as measured by FSA data over two years, demonstrates a weakness in standards-based instructional practice.
Intended Outcome	If teachers implement effective standards-based instruction in ELA, math, and science, as well as engage families in support of learning, then student proficiency will increase using the following target indicators: Grade 3 Baseline ELA 39% Target 43%, Baseline Math 42% Target 48%, Grade 4 Baseline ELA 33% Target 38%, Baseline Math 44% Target 47%, Grade 5 Baseline ELA 29% Target 38%, Grade 5 Baseline Math 25% Target 38%, Baseline Science 28% Target 38%. Attaining these targets would give us 322 points and a school grade of C.
Point Person	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Add an additional common collaborative planning time each week so teachers can work together twice a week to develop standards-based lesson plans, standards-based learning activities, and standards focus boards in reading, math, and science. Principal and assistant principals will oversee the scheduling and implementation of these meetings.
Person Responsible	Noelle Robles (noelle.robles@marion.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	A leadership team member will facilitate and/or attend collaborative planning meetings and monitor staff attendance and participation. Regular classroom visits by the administrative team with follow-up will allow administrators to monitor observable differences in Tier I instruction. Quarterly assessments and monthly growth monitoring will allow stakeholders to measure academic achievement in ELA, math, and science.
Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Targeted Small Group Instruction: If teachers utilize targeted small-group instruction in ELA, math, and science, student learning gains and proficiency will increase.
Rationale	Learning gains for students in 3rd through 5th grades in the bottom 25% dropped 24% in math and 15% in reading, and learning gains declined by 21% in math and 7% in ELA for all students in 3rd through 5th grades, indicating a need for targeted small group instruction.
Intended Outcome	If teachers utilize targeted small-group instruction in ELA, math, and science, student learning gains will increase using the following target indicators: 3rd, 4th, 5th ELA Learning Gains Baseline 32% Target 50%, ELA Lowest Performing Baseline 25% Target 50% and Math Learning Gains Baseline 44% Target 50%, Math Lowest Performing Baseline 41% Target 50%. Attaining these targets would give us 322 points and a school grade of C.
Point Person	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Implement targeted small group instruction with regular progress monitoring to meet specific learning needs of student subgroups, including ESE and ELL students. A leadership team member will be assigned to oversee the instructional plan for each subgroup.
Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Regular progress monitoring meetings, classroom intervention logs and student assessment data will be used to monitor the fidelity of MTSS implementation. Improvement in reading fluency for ELL and ESE students will be monitored using the district DRA2 assessment and running records.
Person Responsible	Teresa Forsyth (teresa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

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 Pilot SIP 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.

The school improvement plan provides opportunities for parents to understand the educational goals for the school, brings accountability to parents and community for specific, targeted instructional goals, utilizes school and community resources to meet that goal, and builds a trust relationship between home-school that will bolster teacher, student, and parent confidence in the steps necessary to accomplish those goals.

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.

Our guidance counselors are available to provide individual and small group counseling to meet student needs, such as interactive social groups and the check-in and check-out monitoring system.

We also provide mentoring for students identified by our Early Warning System as being high risk students.

PBIS is a major focus on our campus this year with many student-based activities planned to provide opportunities for students to socialize and be recognized for positive behavior. This year College Park Elementary is piloting the PBIS Interconnected Systems Framework model to intervene and address student behavior and mental health concerns in an effort to increase student academic achievement.

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

STAGGER START is a district wide program designed to assist students in transitioning into local elementary schools. Eight to ten students per day attend school during the first two days giving staff the opportunity to administer assessments to develop one-on-one relationships with students, and to reduce the anxiety associated with starting school. The state's STAR Early Literacy Assessment is one tool used to determine the readiness needs of these kindergarten students. Students who need intensive interventions will receive additional assistance from trained teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing a variety of interventions according to their unique learning needs. During the spring and summer kindergarten enrollment periods, information is shared with parents regarding the state funded voluntary Pre-K opportunities and the Home Instruction of Parents of Pre-School Youngsters (HIPPY). College Park offers two Title I VPK School Year programs to ensure students have a successful transition to kindergarten.

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.

Before the beginning of the school year, the principal and leadership team evaluated the academic needs of the students by analyzing the data provided to us through local and state assessments. Other areas of need were also analyzed specific to our demographic, such as the need for more ELL small group reading materials due to our high population of students whose first language is not English. Orders for materials were coordinated through a series of planning meetings, and when they arrive are cataloged (scanned into local inventory system) and distributed to teachers and staff that are using the materials in instruction or support in ELA, Math, and Science. Weekly leadership meetings, and bi-monthly synergy meetings analyze the effectiveness of the utilization of the resources (personnel, curricular, and instructional) and adjustments are made based on the findings of their effectiveness. Additional professional development or other training may be required to increase the strategic use of those resources. Non-consumable Title I resources, will be bar coded and inventoried annually. Consumables will be maintained in a central location, where administrators and the school secretary will be responsible for distribution of resources.

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

College and Career Readiness

Marion County Public Schools implements standards provided by the state that are set to prepare students for success and make them competitive in the global workplace. Each Florida Standard provides clear expectations for the knowledge and skills students need to master in each grade (K-12) and subject so they will be prepared to succeed in college, careers and life.

Part V: Budget

Total:

\$824,252.50