

Marion County Public Schools

Fort McCoy School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	23

Fort McCoy School

16160 NE HIGHWAY 315, Fort Mc Coy, FL 32134

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jordan Surdam

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	23

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)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
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.

At Fort McCoy School, the staff works together in an environment of mutual respect and understanding toward the common goal of preparing students for a lifetime of learning, productive work, and responsible citizenship by serving the learning needs of the community in both traditional and innovative ways.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fort McCoy School, working together as partners with the total community, will prepare students for the future. We aim to provide an educational program that is academically challenging that includes meaningful instructional strategies and differentiation for all students. 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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fisher, Jennifer	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The Principal supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school.
Dobbins, Matthew	School Counselor	The School Counselor has knowledge and understanding of child development and the unique needs and characteristics of students served. Knowledge and understanding of guidance and counseling principles, programs, and services. Knowledge of tests and measurement theory, and of community resources and services available for student assistance. Ability to counsel and assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in student learning, behavior, and mental health. Ability to administer student assessment and evaluation instruments. Ability to analyze and use data. Ability to verbally communicate and consult with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to maintain sensitivity to multicultural issues.
Favors, Jackie	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) implements disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment.
Taschenberger, Mary	School Counselor	The School Counselor has knowledge and understanding of child development and the unique needs and characteristics of students served. Knowledge and understanding of guidance and counseling principles, programs, and services. Knowledge of tests and measurement theory, and of community resources and services available for student assistance. Ability to counsel and assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in student learning, behavior, and mental health. Ability to administer student assessment and evaluation instruments. Ability to analyze and use data. Ability to verbally communicate and consult with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to maintain sensitivity to multicultural issues.
Ostanik, Eric	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal aids the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
	Psychologist	The School Psychologist has knowledge of child growth and development tests, test and measurement theory and foundations, and community resources and services available for student assistance. Ability to conduct comprehensive psycho-educational evaluations of students. Ability to verbally communicate and consult effectively with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to communicate

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		results of evaluation findings in written reports and correspondence to assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in student learning, behavior, and mental health. Ability to interact successfully with parents, school personnel, and administrators. Skills in communicating effectively orally and in writing. Skills and ability to apply and interpret federal, state, and local laws and policies governing the provision of educational services to students with disabilities. Knowledge of laws and rules relating to education and other services for persons with disabilities.
Surdam, Jordan	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal aids the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Blackson, Luke	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) implements disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment.

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	51	83	81	90	85	113	165	167	181	0	0	0	0	1016	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	26	18	17	28	18	37	58	55	0	0	0	0	279	
One or more suspensions	2	6	1	3	6	8	16	22	21	0	0	0	0	85	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	22	0	0	0	0	46	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	44	34	56	70	52	0	0	0	0	267	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	10	19	21	20	22	35	83	92	109	0	0	0	0	411	

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	2	4	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

74

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/1/2019

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

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

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	40%	42%	61%	44%	43%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	45%	59%	45%	49%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	36%	54%	39%	42%	51%
Math Achievement	38%	41%	62%	45%	40%	58%
Math Learning Gains	45%	51%	59%	52%	54%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	43%	52%	44%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	45%	40%	56%	45%	39%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	49%	53%	78%	49%	54%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	51 (0)	83 (0)	81 (0)	90 (0)	85 (0)	113 (0)	165 (0)	167 (0)	181 (0)	1016 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	22 (6)	26 (19)	18 (18)	17 (19)	28 (14)	18 (17)	37 (28)	58 (51)	55 (67)	279 (239)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	6 (3)	1 (3)	3 (5)	6 (4)	8 (5)	16 (12)	22 (28)	21 (27)	85 (87)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (12)	0 (14)	0 (18)	0 (6)	0 (22)	8 (17)	16 (29)	22 (17)	46 (135)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (0)	44 (23)	34 (22)	56 (42)	70 (39)	52 (53)	267 (179)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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.

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	58%	44%	14%	58%	0%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	34%	49%	-15%	58%	-24%
	2018	44%	43%	1%	56%	-12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	33%	45%	-12%	56%	-23%
	2018	47%	46%	1%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019	38%	45%	-7%	54%	-16%
	2018	44%	44%	0%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
07	2019	36%	46%	-10%	52%	-16%
	2018	41%	43%	-2%	51%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2019	47%	50%	-3%	56%	-9%
	2018	38%	49%	-11%	58%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	49%	-2%	62%	-15%
	2018	40%	48%	-8%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
	2018	33%	47%	-14%	62%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	24%	45%	-21%	60%	-36%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
06	2019	35%	46%	-11%	55%	-20%
	2018	37%	42%	-5%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
07	2019	43%	49%	-6%	54%	-11%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	54%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	30%	41%	-11%	46%	-16%
	2018	38%	43%	-5%	45%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	44%	-6%	53%	-15%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	47%	44%	3%	48%	-1%
	2018	41%	46%	-5%	50%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	65%	-14%	71%	-20%
2018	55%	64%	-9%	71%	-16%
Compare		-4%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	54%	32%	61%	25%
2018	100%	57%	43%	62%	38%
Compare		-14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%

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

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	7	35	40	12	40	40	17	29			
HSP	34	49	29	44	50	42	40	82			
MUL	38	30		50	37						
WHT	40	40	33	37	44	36	44	48	46		
FRL	34	40	34	32	44	35	38	45	42		
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		

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	375

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
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	41
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

According to School Grade Components data, the lowest performing component was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Our students scored 33% proficiency. The subgroups data revealed that the SWD ELA achievement was 7% which contributed to this low score. Some factors that contributed to these non-proficient scores were continuing substitutes in several classrooms and attendance issues.

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

The data components that showed the greatest decline were ELA Learning Gains, Math Learning Gains, and Social Studies learning gains. All three of these components declined 9% from the previous school year. Some factors that contributed to these non-proficient scores were continuing substitutes in several classrooms and attendance issues.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Social Studies achievement. Fort McCoy School was 29% lower than the state average. A factor that contributed to this decline is a continuous substitute in an advanced Civics course.

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

Fort McCoy School did not have a data component that improved from the previous school year. There was a decline in each component.

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

Based on data from the EWS data, two potential concerns for Fort McCoy School are 1. the number of students who have two or more early warning indicators and 2. the number of students who attend school less than 90 percent of the school year.

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

1. Increase student proficiency and learning gains in ELA.
2. Increase student proficiency and learning gains in Math.
3. Increase student proficiency and learning gains in Science.
4. Increase student proficiency and learning gains in Social Studies.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Instruction: Instructional Activities/Strategies
Rationale	<p>Based on the state data from the Florida Standards Assessments, Fort McCoy School showed a decline in all areas except science achievement and acceleration. This data indicates that we need to focus on purposeful tier 1 instructional and differentiation strategies that target students weakest areas in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies then proficiency rates and learning gains will improve overall.</p> <p>If teachers provide intentional, meaningful and purposeful tier 1 instructional and differentiation strategies, then student proficiency (including students with a federal index below 41%) will increase by 3% or more in both ELA, Math, Science and Civics as measured by FSA, FSSA and EOC.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Grade ELA Math Science Civics</p> <p>3rd 58% 61% 47% 50%</p> <p>4th 34% 37% 35% 38%</p> <p>5th 33% 36% 24% 27% 38% 41%</p> <p>6th 38% 41% 35% 38%</p> <p>7th 36% 39% 43% 46% 51% 54%</p> <p>8th 47% 50% 30% 33% 47% 50%</p> <p>SWD 7% to 10% 12% to 15% 17% to 20% 29% to 32%</p> <p>ED 34% to 37% 32% to 35% 38% to 41% 45% to 48%</p> <p>Multi-Racial 38% to 41% 50% to 53%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Fisher (jennifer.fisher@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The Administrative team, Principal, Assistant Principals, and Content- Area Specialist will observe tier 1 instruction that occurs in the classroom. The team will provide feedback in a timely manner to improve any concerns in instruction. Third grade-fifth grade teachers will meet with the administrative team for weekly collaborative meetings to plan for standards, evaluate learner performance and problem solve. Middle School teachers will meet with the administrative team to review instruction and data scheduled on an on-going basis. Teachers will use data from iReady, weekly lessons, and standards mastery assessments to guide their instruction. The leadership team will analyze student data to determine teacher and learner needs as well as provide instructional support and resources as needed. Teachers will be provided professional development in research based instructional strategies to assist in creating engaging learning opportunities in the classroom.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Research suggests that when teacher collaboration is properly implemented, there are benefits for both teachers and students. "Student achievement gains are greater in schools with stronger collaborative environments and in classrooms of teachers who are stronger collaborators". (Learning Forward)</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Frequent classroom observations and feedback provided. 2. Collaborative Meetings with administration. (weekly for Elementary) 3. Research based professional development opportunities. 4. 5.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2

Title Process: On-going Professional Development

Rationale Teachers need professional development because it provides ongoing opportunities for educators to improve their knowledge and skills so they can help students achieve. When our educators learn, our students learn more.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve If FMS provides teachers with effective professional development in the following area: AVID, CKLA, and standards aligned formative assessments, then students will increase learning gains by 3% or more as measured by FSA.

Grade ELA Math
 3/4th 34% 37% 37% 40%
 5th 43% 46% 37% 40%
 6th 39% 42% 44% 47%
 7th 30% 33% 52% 55%
 8th 53% 56% 45% 48%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Jennifer Fisher (jennifer.fisher@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy The Administrative team, Principal, Assistant Principals, Content- Area Specialist and District specialists will observe tier 1 instruction that occurs in the classroom and make professional development decisions based on data gathered. Teachers will be provided professional development in research based instructional strategies to assist in creating engaging learning opportunities in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy When educators engage in professional development at their schools with their peers, they learn from one another, support one another, and assist in holding each other accountable for applying what they learned. Offering professional development during the school year makes it easier for educators to apply what they learn immediately which allows students to benefit immediately. (Learning Forward)

Action Step

Description

1. Frequent classroom observations to obtain data on what professional development needs are necessary.
2. Deliver research based instructional strategies once a month on early release days.
3. Content Area Specialist will provide on-going support to struggling teachers.
4. District Specialists will provide on-going support to struggling teachers.
- 5.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Process: Family Engagement
Rationale	Based on the state data from the Florida Standards Assessments, Fort McCoy School showed a decline in all areas except science achievement and acceleration. This information shows a need for improvement and focusing on improving family engagement is way to increase student achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>If we provide capacity building strategies to parents and families that address and promote positive home environments, then the at home environment will foster continued learning linked to core subjects and social emotional learning (SEL) strategies as measured by FSA and FSSA.</p> <p>*up to 3% proficiency increase</p> <p>Grade ELA Math</p> <p>3rd 58% 61% 47% 50%</p> <p>4th 34% 37% 35% 38%</p> <p>5th 33% 36% 24% 27%</p> <p>6th 38% 41% 35% 38%</p> <p>7th 36% 39% 43% 46%</p> <p>8th 47% 50% 30% 33%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Fisher (jennifer.fisher@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Fort McCoy School will provide clear communication of school-wide policies and procedures, educational focus, and information about family engagement opportunities to families through the school website, Skylert messages, school marquees and monthly newsletters.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research from the University of Chicago states that strong family and community involvement is significantly and positively related to student achievement. One study found a significant relationship between school family partnership programs emphasizing teacher and parent collaboration and frequent communication between teachers and parents and academic achievement of students. A different study found that in schools with higher levels of trust between teachers and families, student achievement in math and reading was higher.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep school website updated. 2. Send frequent Skylert messages to families. 3. Utilize the school marquee to advertise events. 4. Send home a monthly newsletter. 5. Refer to school-based Parent and Family Engagement Plan
Person Responsible	Anne Wittock (anne.wittock@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).

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.

Our site-based Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) will describe our commitment to engage parents and families in the education of their children and to build the capacity to implement family engagement strategies and activities designed to achieve the school and student academic achievement goals. Through the following capacity building events; we will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Title I Annual Meeting

To provide an explanation of Title I and begin the ongoing discussion of school wide participation and of its link to student achievement.

September 2019

Christmas Literacy

Increased literacy in ELA/capacity building

December 2019

Family Engagement Event

Increased literacy in math or science capacity building

February 2020

Goal: If we provide capacity building strategies to parents and families that address and promote positive home environments, then the at home environment will foster continued learning linked to core subjects and social emotional learning (SEL) strategies as measured by District Assessment Data such as I-ready Diagnostic Assessments.

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.

MCPS Psychological Services supports the united efforts of parents, educators, and the community to raise student performance. Psychological Services provides assessment, consultation, progress monitoring, and mental health services to improve the academic and emotional well-being of all students.

Crisis Response Resources:

Information and resources to assist parents and educators help students through a time of crisis:

Talking to Children About Violence: Tips for Parents and Teachers

Bullies and Victims: A Primer for Parents

When Grief/Loss Hits Close to Home: Tips for Caregivers

Care for the Caregiver: Tips for Families and Educators

What You CAN Do - Meaningful Action Matters in the Face of Violence

Helping Children Cope With Traumatic Events

Trauma Informed Care Resources

Suicide Prevention - 13 Reasons Why: Information Sheet and Resource Guide
Prevención del Suicidio Juvenil: Consejos para Padres y Educadores?

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 an orientation for all incoming PRE-K, Kindergarten, and 6th grade students to help them transition.

We have an Elementary and Middle School Counselor to assist students with any social and emotional needs they have. They are able to refer to other community agencies if needed.

Early learning, elementary, middle and high school curriculum maps are shared and utilized throughout all levels of education to ensure an alignment of standards and expectations to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of student in transition from one school level to another.

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.

Elementary

Providing differentiated instruction for students at all levels is a best practice to meet students' needs in mastering the Florida Standards (FS)/Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS). Instructionally sound strategies for grouping students will be used to enhance the academic achievement of all students. Any grouping of students shall provide opportunities for the regrouping of students during a portion of the school day (i.e., within the general education classroom, during specials, lunch, or other portion of the school week).

b. Ability groups are organized according to accelerated needs such as higher-level coursework or remedial needs of individual students. Ability group configurations are flexible and continually monitored for student progress and movement.

Middle

Overall student performance on state/district curriculum content is based on proficiency utilizing district-adopted textbooks and supplemental materials approved for the assigned grade level, as well as district and state assessments. Parents may access their student's electronic instructional materials through the MCPS student desktop portal by using the student's login credentials. Each middle school student should earn three units in middle grades or higher courses in ELA which may include courses earning

high school credit. Each middle school student should earn three units in middle school mathematics which may include courses for high school credit. Each middle school student should earn three units in middle grades or higher courses in science including instruction in Earth Science, Life Science, and Physical Science. Each middle school student should earn three units in middle grades or higher courses in social studies, which shall include the study of government, economics, geography, and history (including World, US, and Florida History).

Each site Principal is responsible for site-based inventory of resources/services as well as necessary problem solving and application.

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

The district of 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 level (K-12) and subject area, so they will be prepared to succeed in college, a career and be functional in society on a daily basis. At the elementary level, this is established through STEM and STEAM curriculum, off and on campus field trips, and business and community volunteers.

Middle school CTE programs are open to all students and do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, disability, marital status, pregnancy, sexual orientation, or genetic information in its educational programs, services, or activities. Middle school CTE courses are designed to provide an articulated link between the career awareness programs of the middle school and the comprehensive CTE programs of the high school. Middle school CTE programs shall adhere to course descriptions and student performance standards as established by the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instruction: Instructional Activities/Strategies	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Process: On-going Professional Development	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Process: Family Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00