Horizon Academy At Marion Oaks

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Horizon Academy At Marion Oaks

365 MARION OAKS DR, Ocala, FL 34473

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Conner

Start Date for this Principal: 5/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (43%)
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

Horizon Academy At Marion Oaks

365 MARION OAKS DR, Ocala, FL 34473

[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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

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.

The mission of Horizon Academy is to nurture the development of responsible, thoughtful citizens for life in an increasingly reliant global society by creating environments in which students are challenged to achieve more, to be creative, and to actively participate in and be accountable for their learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Horizon Academy, in partnership with the Marion Oaks Community, is committed to presenting a safe and respectful setting which inspires excellence and challenges all students to develop their talents as healthy, life-long learners, achievers, and responsible citizens.

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
Maier, Donald	Principal	The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision–making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need; and communicates with parents as necessary.
Consider, Susan	Dean	The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/ Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families.
Pittman, Dawn	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Scofield, Susan	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Perry, Dustin	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wiggins, Erika	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Fox, Lee	Instructional Coach	Content Area Specialist (Instructional Coach) The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	210	195	208	219	0	0	0	0	832
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	23	19	32	45	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	21	14	11	15	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	28	9	18	30	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	183	103	138	134	0	0	0	0	558
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	84	73	83	105	0	0	0	0	345

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	8	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

40

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	22	19	17	28	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	27	12	18	38	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	16	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	41	101	102	0	0	0	0	261

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	48	10	28	34	0	0	0	0	120

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	22	19	17	28	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	27	12	18	38	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	16	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	41	101	102	0	0	0	0	261

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	48	10	28	34	0	0	0	0	120

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	43%	49%	54%	41%	45%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	54%	54%	53%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	46%	47%	44%	36%	44%
Math Achievement	44%	54%	58%	34%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	56%	58%	57%	56%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	51%	48%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	35%	46%	51%	33%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	70%	72%	58%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	195 (0)	208 (0)	219 (0)	622 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	19 (19)	32 (17)	45 (28)	96 (64)
One or more suspensions	14 (12)	11 (18)	15 (38)	40 (68)
Course failure in ELA or Math	9 (4)	18 (0)	30 (16)	57 (20)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	103 (41)	138 (101)	134 (102)	375 (244)
	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
06	2019	49%	45%	4%	54%	-5%
	2018	35%	44%	-9%	52%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	41%	46%	-5%	52%	-11%
	2018	35%	43%	-8%	51%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	41%	50%	-9%	56%	-15%
	2018	51%	49%	2%	58%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	34%	46%	-12%	55%	-21%
	2018	26%	42%	-16%	52%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	45%	49%	-4%	54%	-9%
	2018	37%	49%	-12%	54%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
08	2019	32%	41%	-9%	46%	-14%
	2018	21%	43%	-22%	45%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	31%	44%	-13%	48%	-17%
	2018	34%	46%	-12%	50%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	67%	-67%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	65%	-10%	71%	-16%
2018	52%	64%	-12%	71%	-19%
Compare		3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	70%	-70%	70%	-70%
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	54%	46%	61%	39%
2018	98%	57%	41%	62%	36%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	51%	44%	57%	38%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		95%			

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	14	35	26	12	46	48	16	20			
ELL	28	47	41	29	57	61	22	52	45		
BLK	40	43	30	35	47	37	29	48	71		
HSP	41	50	39	42	58	55	30	68	65		
MUL	36	33	27	34	50	50	40	40			
WHT	52	57	46	56	64	50	49	50	63		
FRL	41	47	35	41	53	48	32	56	68		
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	9	36	41	19	38	29	19	21			
ELL	19	39	38	27	49	50	15	50			
BLK	41	51	33	34	51	38	34	50	77		
HSP	41	46	34	38	54	49	39	54	62		
MUL	33	54	90	28	35	40	24				
WHT	42	44	43	45	55	50	49	57	67		
FRL	40	48	41	38	52	45	40	53	68		
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	37	34	6	34	33	14	26			
ELL	19	55	49	23	56	49	14	29			
BLK	42	49	43	33	49	38	24	58			
HSP	37	53	44	34	61	49	32	56			
MUL	36	58	54	31	63		45				
WHT	44	54	41	35	54	56	37	62			
FRL	39	52	43	33	56	48	31	60			

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	50
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	497
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	44
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	42
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	51
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
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	54
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	48
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.

The lowest performing category was with 8th grade mathematics (32% L3 & above). Contributing factors include an excessive number of Level 1 and 2 students entering the 8th grade, as well as 25% of the 8th grade students in EOC courses. Those students passed at a 99% rate. Had those students taken an FSA tested course, the 8th grade pass rate would be much higher. That being said, 55% of 8th grade students in an FSA tested course did have learning gains, coupled with an 11% increase in a passing score. Based on positive learning gains in the 7th grade, it can be expected that achievement levels in the 8th grade class should increase this school year.

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

Both 5th & 6th grade mathematics showed the greatest declines (13% each; both from 47-34% proficiency). 147/161 incoming 5th graders were non-proficient in mathematics. That, coupled with serious concerns in behavior, contributed to the decline. In 6th grade, the single biggest factor in a the drop was in the inexperience of the instructional unit and the focus of basic skills and not grade-level standards. For 18-19, 12/15 6th grade math sections will be taught by experienced (10+ years) teachers with histories of previous success.

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 greatest gap between the school and the state occurred with 5th grade mathematics. Again, contributing factors are the large percentage of non-proficient students entering the grade in 2018, as well as the behavior concerns.

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

ELA in the 6th grade showed the single largest improvement (14% on the grade level; 10% for the cohort). Much of this success goes to the writing across the curriculum for the three past years, as well as a re-evaluation of instructional techniques to ensure more pertinent student-student conversations, as well as on grade-level assessments. The ELA teachers worked well in collaborative planning to help ensure success in all grade levels and the 6th grade scores reflected that in a tremendous improvement.

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

One area of concern is the number of 5th grade students scoring Level 1 on the statewide assessment (ELA or Math). Most of these students were found to be two or more levels below grade level, when assessed diagnostically. Continued focus on the Standards, taught on grade level, along with using the diagnostics and the instructional piece of I-Ready will continue to bridge the gap for those students.

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

1. ON grade-level instruction and authentic assessments for all students based on the item specification (ELA and Math).
2. Teacher focus on our SWDs, enduring that differentiating, when needed, is being utilized, and that all SWDs have contact with their inclusion teacher
3. Rekindling and rebuilding relationships across the campus (teacher-teacher; teacher-students; teachers-support staff) to help grow trust and promote a growth mindset.
4. Collaborative planning and data meetings that focus on our ELA, Math, and Science standards and assessment results (formative and summative).
5. Support the successes of 18-19 to help promote continued growth in key areas.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Thoughtful Work
Rationale	By committing to instructional practices where students demonstrate their learning, completing on grade-level tasks within the Standards that validate their ability to analyze, synthesize and evaluate new content which are taught, we will build a sense of expectations among students and teachers that will create a learning environment more conducive to the learning process.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	IF we focus on rigorous, thoughtful work, (daily tasks and assessments), then ELA achievement levels can be expected to grow from 43% to 45% and Math achievement levels from 44% to 47%. Learning gains in ELA can be anticipated to increase from 50% to 53% and Math Learning Gains are projected to move from 50% to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donald Maier (donald.maier@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	According to the research and educational evidence of outcomes provided by the district's ICLE training, it is essential to student learning that a school's focus contain elements related to relationships, rigor, and relevance during the learning process
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Focusing on a more rigorous learning environment via thoughtful work and intentional questioning will ensure lessons and learning are more closely aligned with high expectations of student learning and performance based on standards and learning outcomes.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teacher self-assessment inventory of instructional skills 2. Focused collaborative planning by department with admin and admin-support personnel as facilitators 3. Whole school book study regarding relationships with students 4. Re-examining of the RRR framework 5. Peer-Peer lesson reviews 6. Teacher critiques of classroom instruction videos of self (SWVL) 7. Quarterly data chats with department PLCs 8. Crate walks 3X/quarter 9. Coaching sessions with administrator every three weeks
Person Responsible	Donald Maier (donald.maier@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Intentional Questioning
Rationale	Creating an instructional environment in which students must fully explain and justify their thinking when responding to questions that demonstrate different levels of thinking, including questions that require synthesis, analysis and evaluation of information will allow students to acquire content information critical to their academic success.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	IF we focus on planning for and asking intentional, higher-order questions within the confines of the lesson, as well as on all assessments, then predicable ELA achievement levels will grow from 43% to 45%. Math achievement levels will grow from 44% to 47%. Learning gains in ELA can be anticipated to increase from 50% to 53% and Math Learning Gains are projected to move from 50% to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donald Maier (donald.maier@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	According to the research and educational evidence of outcomes provided by the district's ICLE training, it is essential to student learning that a school's focus contain elements related to relationships, rigor, and relevance during the learning process
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Focusing on a more rigorous learning environment via thoughtful work and intentional questioning will ensure lessons and learning are more closely aligned with high expectations of student learning and performance based on standards and learning outcomes.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teacher self-assessment inventory of instructional skills 2. Focused collaborative planning by department with admin and admin-support personnel as facilitators 3. The use of Planbook.com to facilitate lesson planning 4. Re-examining of the RRR framework 5. Peer-Peer lesson reviews 6. Teacher critiques of classroom instruction videos of self (SWVL) 7. Quarterly data chats with department PLCs 8. Crate walks 3X/quarter 9. Coaching sessions with administrator every three weeks
Person Responsible	Donald Maier (donald.maier@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Continued Improvement within Multiracial and SWD subgroups
Rationale	By committing to a focus on Multiracial and SWD subgroups, we will bring those students above the 41% threshold of school achievement level and provide more opportunities for those students enjoy on grade-level instruction and success.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we focus on differentiation of all students, coupled with tutoring opportunities for those students that need individualized attention, then struggling students will develop study and learning skills that will help set them up for future years and the Federal Index points will increase from 27% to 32% with the SWD subgroup. Within the multiracial subgroup, the Federal Index Points will likely increase from 39% to 43%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donald Maier (donald.maier@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research has shown that well-designed tutoring programs that use volunteers and other nonprofessionals as tutors can be effective in improving children's reading skills. Students with below-average reading skills who are tutored by volunteers show significant gains in reading skills when compared with similar students who do not receive tutoring from a quality tutoring program. Well-structured tutoring sessions in which the content and delivery of instruction is carefully scripted; (4) Careful monitoring and reinforcement of progress; (5) Frequent and regular tutoring sessions, with each session between 10 and 60 minutes daily; and (6) Specially designed interventions for the 17-20% of children with severe reading difficulties. (US DOE,2001)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Tutoring gives students individualized attention that they don't always get in a classroom. This helps students who struggle to keep up. Tutoring may also help students develop study and learning skills that will help set them up for future years.

Action Step	
Description	1. Allot funds to pay for tutors 2. Identify struggling students in ELA & Math 3. ID and train needed tutors 4. Conference with ID'd students with parents to address expectations. 5. Reevaluate program after 12 weeks 5.
Person Responsible	Donald Maier (donald.maier@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).

In addition to the school wide focus of thoughtful work and intentional questioning, the staff will also participate in a book study focusing on establishment and developing relationships with students and staff. Additionally, intentional, focused data meetings will occur quarterly with all staff and teacher-student data chats will occur bi-weekly in math and ELA classrooms. For those extremely struggling

math students, MATH180 will be offered to help further bridge the learning gap between students who are multiple grade-level behind, along with the continued instructional support of I-Ready.

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.

In an effort to provide meaningful activities that parents/family are eager to attend, we have chosen different times and days spread throughout the school year to offer planned involvement activities. Some of the activities such as Math, Science and Literacy night are subject related. Those meetings include strategies and materials parents may use to engage their children at home. Other activities such as Holiday Decoration Night are for fun and sharing, while the Principal & Parent Chats and Parent Teacher Conferences are intended for parents to learn more about their individual child.

There are several opportunities for our community to assist with activities that not only build relationships within the community but also are intended to improve school achievement. For example in October the Math Night will be held at our community Win-Dixie. The store employees work toward making our evening a pleasant, and meaningful learning experience for all who attend.

Our strong Mentor Program is built upon the idea that community members feel the need to assist us with the education of our students.

In March we will hold a STEAMspirations day that is dependent upon community support to fill many of the presentation time slots available.

We also have full time interpreters and other staff members who are available to translate for our non-English speaking families and students

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
Prevensión 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.

Horizon Academy at Marion Oaks hosts groups of upcoming fifth graders in the spring. A tour of the campus is conducted, administrators and core personnel are introduced, with expectations of students being explained and questions answered.

Ready, Set, High School is offered for seventh and eighth graders, educating students and parents regarding the opportunities available in area high schools and linking them to post secondary institutions. High schools within our feeder zone are invited to conduct meetings outlining opportunities available to students at those schools. Student groups are welcomed to partner with local high schools, allowing groups, such as FFA, to bond with their high school counterparts.

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.

The School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) consistently monitors student achievement data and provides intervention opportunities to students as needed. Progress is monitored and interventions are adjusted based on student growth data.

The school-based team identifies areas in need of improvement and sets goals that are articulated in the School Improvement Plan. An action plan is then created to address each goal area.

The team then meets regularly to set individual goals for students and to progress monitor student growth. Teachers are included in conversation about student growth and their own 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:
The Horizon Academy at Marion Oaks Title I program focuses on providing resources to support and supplement student learning. These resources include a Curriculum Coach, student supplies, non-instructional paraprofessionals who work with students on remediation and intervention strategies, and funding for parent nights.

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

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.

MCPS implements standards provided by the state which 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. Sixty 8th graders will receive an opportunity to go to local college for the College and Career Expo.

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: Thoughtful Work	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Intentional Questioning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Continued Improvement within Multiracial and SWD subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00