

Volusia County Schools

George W. Marks Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	15

George W. Marks Elementary School

1000 N GARFIELD AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/georgemarks/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Shannon Young

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Volusia 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	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	15

George W. Marks Elementary School

1000 N GARFIELD AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/georgemarks/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>68%</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>38%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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 the cooperative support of the school, family, and community, our students will develop academic and citizenship skills to become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

George Marks Elementary, where everyone succeeds together!

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
YOUNG, SHANNON	Principal	Met to determine student needs through data analysis and build a positive culture and climate for all stakeholders.
Beeghly, Elaine	Assistant Principal	
Linan, Becky	Teacher, K-12	

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	66	101	69	78	92	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	12	28	13	15	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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)

41

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/9/2019

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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	59%	56%	57%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	48%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	46%	53%	33%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	59%	63%	59%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	62%	44%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	43%	51%	29%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	57%	53%	60%	59%	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	66 (0)	101 (0)	69 (0)	78 (0)	92 (0)	85 (0)	491 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 (0)	28 (0)	13 (0)	15 (0)	12 (2)	18 (5)	98 (7)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2)	0 (4)	2 (6)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (2)	22 (4)	29 (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	67%	58%	9%	58%	9%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
	2018	63%	58%	5%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	59%	7%	64%	2%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	56%	-9%	53%	-6%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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
SWD	25	31	38	27	50	46	14				
ELL	46	35		51	42						
BLK	45	57		42	55		36				
HSP	49	39	30	53	44	27	50				
MUL	38			31							
WHT	65	57	52	66	70	57	53				
FRL	53	49	44	52	52	37	40				

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	21	34	33	26	39	41	30				
ELL	31	48	46	43	59	45	23				
BLK	50	43		56	40						
HSP	44	54	38	46	46	37	44				
MUL	20			40							
WHT	57	50	38	60	50	39	67				
FRL	44	42	38	50	45	36	49				

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	24	38	35	28	32	23	32				
ELL	24	33	27	39	38	33					
BLK	43	50		57	42						
HSP	38	38	22	49	38	29	41				
MUL	40										
WHT	65	50	38	61	43	28	65				
FRL	48	45	33	51	38	30	53				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	35
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Math lowest quartile (learning gains) was the data component that had the lowest performance. When disaggregating data the EWS report for attendance showed a rate of 95%. Math demonstrated no change in the learning gains for the lowest quartile despite several different supports that were put into place (math intervention block on the master schedule, Waterford/Successmaker, math tutoring).

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

Science was the data component that had the greatest decline from the prior year. When disaggregating data the EWS report showed an attendance rate of only 95%. New science curriculum was adopted and contributed to learning gaps for fair game standards. Science demonstrated a significant decrease in overall student performance, despite several different supports that were put into place (science tutoring, hands-on labs and enrichment activities for advanced learners). Science instruction is now seen as a school wide need, instead of 5th grade only. Hand on labs are incorporated weekly into the lesson planning to ensure students can conceptualize the standards.

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.

Math was the data component that had the greatest gap when compared with state data. When disaggregating data the EWS report showed fifth grade (18 students) with an attendance rate of less than 90% on is now seen as a school wide need, instead of 5th grade only.

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

Math data showed the most improvement for learning gains. A campus-wide math intervention block was placed on the master schedule, Waterford/Successmaker programs were implemented and math tutoring was offered to students who needed additional support.

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

First, fourth and fifth grade students both have a high percentage of attendance concerns as well as students with multiple indicators.

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

1. Professional learning for vertical tracing of science standards
2. Professional learning for the 5E model
3. Professional learning for math interventions strategies
4. Professional learning to increase awareness of classroom diversity
5. Monitor standards based instruction through learning walks and data discussions (using iReady and SMT to identify focus standards and track progress)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	SWD Science Subgroup
Rationale	Low proficiency rates on FSSA, new science curriculum, lack of hands on science instruction
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	With the support of the district science department we are working on identifying the low performance standards and providing specific training in those content areas. Using the VSTs and formative assessments we will monitor student progress quarterly so that student achievement increases on FSSA to 54% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing weekly hands-on science instruction, increase science minutes on the master schedule for primary grade
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Student performance on FSSA and gradebook , determined a significant need for clear identification of science standards and the need for frequent monitoring.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review 2018-2019 data to identify focus standards for each grade level 2. Schedule professional learning for vertical tracing of science standards 3. Administer SMT to establish baseline data/student groups 4. Conduct grade-level progress monitoring in PLCs 5. Conduct quarterly intervention days based on focus standards 6. Monitor standards based instruction through on-going walk-throughs and feedback 7. Diversity training for all grade levels
Person Responsible	SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	Low proficiency rates on FSA, intervention program knowledge and a lack of a math curriculum
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	With the support of the district math department we are working on professional learning to increase knowledge of intervention strategies. We will monitor progress using iReady data so that math proficiency rates increase on FSA from 41% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing math intervention time on the master schedule, intensive professional development on new core math curriculum and math intervention program,
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Student performance on FSA, formative data, and iReady data determined a significant need for tier 2 and 3 interventions

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review 2019-2019 data to identify focus standards for each grade level 2. Schedule professional learning for intervention strategies (Using data to plan math intervention PD, Zearn/Intervention Resource PD) 3. Administer iReady to establish baseline data/student groups 4. Conduct grade-level progress monitoring in PLCs 5. Monitor standards based instruction through on-going walk-throughs and feedback 6. Diversity training for all grade levels
Person Responsible	SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.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).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: SWD Science Subgroup	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00