Marion County Public Schools

Fort Mccoy School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fort Mccoy School

16160 NE HIGHWAY 315, Fort Mc Coy, FL 32134

[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)
Combination School PK-8	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	12%

School Grades History

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

Through a caring and inviting environment, Fort McCoy School will provide an engaging, quality education to all students every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fort McCoy School, working together as partners with the total community, will prepare students for the future. We will aim to provide an educational program that is academically challenging; our educational program engages each student by linking curricular content to previous knowledge and experience while remaining exciting enough to promote further exploration of new ideas. We recognize that we cannot reach our goals without the hard work of our Fort McCoy students, parents, and our community.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Jones, Renee	Principal
Dreher, Lisa	Assistant Principal
Dobbins, Matthew	School Counselor
Favors, Jackie	Dean
Blackson, Luke	Dean
Taschenberger, Mary	School Counselor
Ostanik, Eric	Assistant Principal

Duties

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

All team members share in the responsibility of making decisions that serve the needs of our students and community. Through SAC, administrative meetings and other school functions they support the mission and vision of the school. The assistant principals will collect data, assist with planning professional development, conduct walkthroughs and assist with parent nights/community involvement. The deans will help with the implementation of the attendance procedures/incentives, discipline interventions and suspension reductions. The guidance counselors will work with social workers and the rest of the team to support student needs.

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	6	19	18	19	14	17	28	51	67	0	0	0	0	239
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	5	4	5	12	28	27	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	12	14	18	6	22	17	29	17	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	23	22	42	39	53	0	0	0	0	179

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	1	0	1	2	6	7	16	25	0	0	0	0	58

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	1	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	18
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	16

Date this data was collected
Sunday 8/12/2018

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	19	12	15	15	13	15	34	51	51	0	0	0	0	225
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	5	4	5	12	28	27	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	26	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5 or more referrals	0	1	2	0	1	2	6	16	20	0	0	0	0	48
3+ failures in any course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	29	21	0	0	0	0	62

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	1	1	5	1	16	16	15	0	0	0	0	58

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	19	12	15	15	13	15	34	51	51	0	0	0	0	225
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	5	4	5	12	28	27	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	26	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5 or more referrals	0	1	2	0	1	2	6	16	20	0	0	0	0	48
3+ failures in any course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	29	21	0	0	0	0	62

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	1	1	5	1	16	16	15	0	0	0	0	58

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?

The data component that performed lowest was ELA lowest quartile. While it was already low, we still are below what we were in 2015-16. This area is our area of focus. ELA Learning gains in the bottom 25% had the lowest performance with ELA at 40%. In ELA, this has been a trend over the past three years. In 15-16 and 16-17. The ELA Learning Gains in the Bottom 25% improved by 1% (from 39%) in 16-17. In 15-16 the learning gains were higher at 44%. There was a 5% drop between the 15-16 school year (44%) and the 16-17 school year (39%). The increase from the 16-17 school year (39%) to the 17-18 school year (40%) was an improvement of 1% which was not equal to the 15-16 school year (44%). The ELA Bottom Quartile 5% decrease was still a trend in that there was not a significant improvement.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline from last year is math achievement as we lost 3% in this area. The largest decline from the 16-17 (45%) school year to the 17-18 (42%) school year came from the FSA math achievement which reflected a 3% loss. Overall, there was an increase from the 2015-16 scores of 40%. In the contrast, math learning gains were made with 16-17 school year, 52% of the students had made learning gains in the Bottom 25%. For the 17-18 school year, 54% of the students in the Bottom 25% made learning gains.

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

The component that had the biggest gap when it is compared to the state average is social studies when analyzing the school CIVIC'S EOC. For the 17-18 school year, FMS is at 58% and the state is at 77% proficiency. This score reflects an improvement over the 16-17 scores of 49% which was a slight dip from the 2015-16 proficiency of 50%.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is social studies as measured by the CIVICS EOC. For the 17-18 school year (58%) reflects a 9% increase which is not a trend (16-17=49%, 15-16 50%) but we plan to continue this growth by incorporating many of the same strategies this year.

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

The actions that led to improvement was teacher training, curriculum map/lesson plan alignment, district support with strategies and student exposure to resources for higher questioning.

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	43%	42%	60%	40%	41%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	48%	57%	45%	45%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	40%	52%	44%	42%	49%
Math Achievement	42%	41%	61%	40%	38%	56%
Math Learning Gains	54%	53%	58%	46%	43%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	44%	52%	33%	33%	48%
Science Achievement	43%	42%	57%	40%	39%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	56%	77%	50%	51%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (19)	19 (12)	18 (15)	19 (15)	14 (13)	17 (15)	28 (34)	51 (51)	67 (51)	239 (225)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	3 (3)	3 (3)	5 (5)	4 (4)	5 (5)	12 (12)	28 (28)	27 (27)	87 (87)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	12 (0)	14 (0)	18 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	17 (6)	29 (24)	17 (26)	135 (56)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	23 (0)	22 (0)	42 (0)	39 (0)	53 (0)	179 (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	43%	46%	-3%	57%	-14%
	2017	57%	50%	7%	58%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	44%	43%	1%	56%	-12%
	2017	44%	52%	-8%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2018	47%	46%	1%	55%	-8%
	2017	53%	47%	6%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2018	44%	44%	0%	52%	-8%
	2017	46%	44%	2%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
07	2018	41%	43%	-2%	51%	-10%
	2017	27%	42%	-15%	52%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2018	38%	49%	-11%	58%	-20%
	2017	42%	48%	-6%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	40%	48%	-8%	62%	-22%
	2017	51%	48%	3%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	33%	47%	-14%	62%	-29%
	2017	41%	55%	-14%	64%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
05	2018	48%	50%	-2%	61%	-13%
	2017	64%	45%	19%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
06	2018	37%	42%	-5%	52%	-15%
	2017	34%	37%	-3%	51%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
07	2018	48%	49%	-1%	54%	-6%
	2017	36%	47%	-11%	53%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	38%	43%	-5%	45%	-7%
	2017	43%	43%	0%	46%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	44%	49%	-5%	55%	-11%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	41%	46%	-5%	50%	-9%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		41%				

BIOLOGY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017	0%	61%	-61%	63%	-63%

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	55%	64%	-9%	71%	-16%
2017	48%	64%	-16%	69%	-21%
Compare		7%			

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	57%	43%	62%	38%
2017	86%	53%	33%	60%	26%
Compare		14%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
2017					

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	8	29	28	9	36	39	13	17			
HSP	44	55		42	68	83	30	62			
MUL	38	47		50	53						
WHT	43	49	40	42	53	39	42	56	37		
FRL	40	48	38	38	51	43	38	52	32		
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	9	34	44	11	38	37	22	12			
HSP	42	43	38	39	49	31	33	35			
MUL	57	43		52	52						
WHT	43	45	40	45	52	45	45	50	38		
FRL	39	43	40	39	49	40	42	46	36		

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	Learning Expectations with instructional activities and strategies that include embedded formative assessments for reading and writing
Rationale	According to our Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the data showing a significant decrease at elementary level and limited success at the middle school, it is evident that reading and writing instruction must be a primary focus.
Intended Outcome	If FMS has on-going professional development, implementing and monitoring the high yield strategies, then we will see growth at all levels. Grade Baseline Target 3rd 43% 57% 4th 44% 56% 5th 47% 55% 6th 44% 52% 7th 41% 51% 8th 38% 58%
Point Person	Renee Jones (renee.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	Administrative team will ensure collaborative planning with grade level, learning walks and ongoing professional development will be the actions taken to support the focus of reading and writing. Professional development on the new reading program will be ongoing as we support student needs with interventions through iReady, DRA, fundations, read 180, system 44 and Fast Forward.
Person Responsible	Lisa Dreher (lisa.dreher@marion.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Walk through data monitoring of implementation of the Standards focused boards infused with checks for comprehension that align with the expectations set forth in our collaboration will support the DOK needed for student success on assessments. These formative checks will help all monitor how students are able to understand their standards. Quarterly reading data will be collected through these formative teacher based assessments, iReady, Read 180, QSMA, CSMAs and other data available to drive instruction.
Person Responsible	Renee Jones (renee.jones@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.

We are a Title I school and our plan is located on the Parent involvement website. Our plan to build positive relationships with parents, families and community stakeholders will involve professional

development for staff, flexible scheduling of meetings and multiple modes of communication. In this way we will fulfil the school's mission; support the needs of parents and students while empowering staff to meet these needs. https://app1.fldoe.org/bsa/ParentInvolvementPlan

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.

Students have access to the guidance office, where we have two guidance counselors to assist them. Teachers are made aware of any sensitive issues with students on a need to know basis. Teachers are on the lookout for targeted behaviors and seek assistance when and where necessary.

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 initiative designed to assist students in transitioning to Kindergarten. Five to eight students per day attend school the first week to give teachers an opportunity to administer assessments, develop one-on–one relationships with students, and eliminate student anxiety. FLKRS, IDEL are the assessment tools used to determine readiness needs.

Florida's Voluntary PreK, Headstart are programs currently implemented throughout the district to assist preschoolers with early literacy skills. Ongoing communication is provided to parents regarding these programs. Federal and state funding is used to provide programs for our preschool children.

The Brigance Preschool Screen and the TERA-3 (Test of Early Reading Abilities) are administered to identify students with low readiness skills, to target instruction, and to evaluate success of the program.

Early Literacy Learning Model (ELLM), a research based curriculum is implemented in all Title I preschool programs.

We have a orientation for all incoming 5th graders to help them transition. We also have a parent night for 6th grade parents to help them transition to middle school expectations. We also have a bus boot camp which helps students understand the expectations of middle school students on the bus.
For our 8th to 9th grade students, we plan to visit one of our feeder high schools during the second semester to help them acclimate to the high school environment, see vocational and academic course offerings and make course selections.

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.

The school based leadership team consistently monitors student achievement data and provide intervention opportunities to students as needed. Progress should be monitored and intervention adjusted based on student growth data. The school based team identifies areas in need of improvement and sets annual goals that are articulated in the continuous improvement monitoring system (CIMS). An action plan is then created to address each goal area. The team then meets periodically to set individual goals for students and to progress monitor student growth. Teachers are included in conversations of students growth and their professional growth needs are identified and prioritized through these conversations and results of team meetings. Data is consistently leveraged to adjust the action plan and

to address new areas of need.

Title I Part A - Most of our Title I budget pays for supplemental paras professionals and instructional personnel.

Title I – Part C – Migrant Program: Fund a Migrant Liaison that works with schools and families to identify students and provide need referrals for families referrals to an after school tutorial program to improve grades, increase promotion, improve attendance and reduce the dropout rate.

Title III – Part A: Services are provided through the District, for education materials and ELL district support services on an as needed basis to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) Dropout prevention and academic intervention programs are funded through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) and Supplemental Academic Instruction categorical funds.

Title 1 inventory is completed through the use of BPI numbers. Any item not having this number will be housed in Destiny in order to track location and usage.

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

Our 8th grade students use the Florida Shines website to facilitate their thinking about the future for college and career awareness. They complete an interest survey which helps them determine possible career choices.

Students are given choices as which electives they want to take each year during the registration process. Several of these electives have certifications available and many of them are able to be program completers at the high school level which will provide potential scholarship opportunities and career specific industry certifications.

Part V: Budget	
Total:	**$469,855.00**