

Marion County Public Schools

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts



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	15
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts

401 NW MARTIN LUTHER KING JR AVE, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: John Kerley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	62%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (87%) 2017-18: A (84%) 2016-17: A (88%) 2015-16: A (87%) 2014-15: A (91%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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	15
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts

401 NW MARTIN LUTHER KING JR AVE, Ocala, FL 34475

[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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	43%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

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

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 faculty, staff, parents, and business partners of Madison Street Academy of Visual and Performing Arts work together to provide a quality learning environment that ensures success through the integration of the arts, academics, and technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Madison Street Academy is committed to providing a quality learning environment that ensures success through the integration of the arts, academics, and technology.

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
Kerley, John	Principal	Provide 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.
Parks, Megan	Assistant Principal	To aid 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.
Cicione, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	To provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with District philosophy, goals and objectives. Reports to Principal or Assistant Principal at assigned location.
Swope, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	To provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with District philosophy, goals and objectives. Reports to Principal or Assistant Principal at assigned location.
Stoddard, Angela	School Counselor	Ability to read, interpret, and follow State Board rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and appropriate state and federal statutes. 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.

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	70	72	68	72	80	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	449
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	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	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	
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)

35

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/7/2019

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

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	0	7	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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

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	0	7	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	94%	47%	57%	99%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	83%	56%	58%	82%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	88%	52%	53%	88%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	91%	51%	63%	98%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	85%	58%	62%	76%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	78%	49%	51%	80%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	93%	47%	53%	95%	51%	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	70 (0)	72 (0)	68 (0)	72 (0)	80 (0)	87 (0)	449 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (1)	0 (0)	2 (2)	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (2)	6 (5)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	3 (1)	2 (0)	10 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	3 (0)	3 (0)	6 (2)

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	93%	44%	49%	58%	35%
	2018	90%	46%	44%	57%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	92%	49%	43%	58%	34%
	2018	92%	43%	49%	56%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	96%	45%	51%	56%	40%
	2018	94%	46%	48%	55%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	49%	38%	62%	25%
	2018	94%	48%	46%	62%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	93%	54%	39%	64%	29%
	2018	97%	47%	50%	62%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	93%	45%	48%	60%	33%
	2018	98%	50%	48%	61%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	93%	44%	49%	53%	40%
	2018	98%	49%	49%	55%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	77			85							

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
ASN	91			100							
BLK	84	83	88	76	71	70	78				
HSP	100	94		96	89						
MUL	100			100							
WHT	96	81	89	94	88	87	96				
FRL	87	83	79	87	81	75	81				
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
ASN	100	80		100	100						
BLK	81	65	67	86	65	64					
HSP	97	95		100	74		100				
MUL	92			100							
WHT	94	71	70	98	81	79	100				
FRL	85	67	65	94	74	68	93				
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	100			100							
ASN	100	100		100	80						
BLK	91	81	73	91	57		92				
HSP	100	79		96	92						
MUL	100	82		100	91						
WHT	100	81	89	99	73	84	95				
FRL	95	79	79	97	69	73	95				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	87
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	612
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	81
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	96
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	79
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	95
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	100
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	90
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	82
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 component that showed the lowest performance was Math learning gains of the lowest 25% (78%). However, this group showed an increase of 1% over the previous year. Thus the trend is upward and a focus on this group will look to yield continued increases in this area.

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

Overall learning gains in math showed the largest decline of any area (6%). However, Madison Street is still at 91% proficiency in this area. The decline was due to the performance of the 5th grade. Several students contributed to this decline. An overall focus in this area in 5th grade will yield more favorable results this school year.

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 has the largest gap when compared to the state average was that of 5th Grade ELA proficiency. Madison Street had 96% of its 5th grade student's at the proficient level. The state average was 56%. Effective tier I instruction is the result of this positive gap.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was that ELA learning gains of the lowest 25%. A focus on differentiated instruction was the main factor for this improvement.

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

Given that we did not have any students identified by the EWS, we do not see a potential area of concern. However, we will always focus on the attendance of our students.

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

1. Learning Gains in Math of 4th & 5th Grade
2. Learning Gains in ELA of 4th & 5th Grade
3. Proficiency level of 5th Grade

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Incorporating a higher level of rigor into classroom instruction
Rationale	If teachers incorporate rigor into academic instruction, including teaching strategies and learning activities, then students will show learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	A 2% increase of learning gains in Math and ELA as measured by the 19-20 FSA, as well as 2% increase in Science proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Kerley (john.kerley@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research has shown (Understanding Rigor in the Classroom) that an increased level of instructional rigor will result in a positive outcome in student learning results.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	A substantial increase in overall achievement level occurred in 18-19 FSA results in both Math and ELA. Given this increase, a focus on learning gains will be necessary to continue this positive trend.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiated instruction (including center instruction) 2. Goal #1: 2% increase in learning gains in 4th & 5th Grade 3. Goal #2: 2% increase in learning gains in 4th & 5th Grade 4. Goal #3: 2% increase in proficiency in 5th Grade
Person Responsible	John Kerley (john.kerley@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).

Of the following priorities, Learning Gains of 4th & 5th Grade in Math, Learning Gains of 4th & 5th grade in ELA, and Science proficiency rates will be our remaining school wide improvement priorities. Incorporating a higher level of rigor into classroom instruction. If teachers incorporate a higher level of rigor into academic instruction, including teaching strategies and learning activities, then students will show learning gains and overall academic improvement.

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.

Madison Street will offer varying days and times for meetings to include all stakeholders in the involvement of the school.

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 provide an Exception Student Education Pre-K Program at our schools for eligible 3 thru 5 year olds. All students are fully integrated into the school thus helping them transition to Kindergarten. MCPS also provides a Summer VPK Program for all eligible Pre-K students.

FLKRS and ECHOS administered to kindergarteners within the first 30 days to evaluate the effectiveness of these our Pre-K programs.

Marion County Public Schools coordinated with Childhood Development Services Inc. and the Early Learning Coalition to get Pre-K students registered for Kindergarten in April. A school based week long Kindergarten Round Up is planned for the Spring and is advertised through community based flyers, letters sent home with current students, and a Skylert message sent out. A special orientation is provided to all parents of incoming kindergarten and other new students to MSA to give them information regarding school policies and procedures to help orient them to the school. STAGGER START is a district initiative to assist kindergarten students in transitioning into local elementary schools. The primary focus of stagger start is to give the staff the opportunity to administer assessments, including FLKRS, and begin to develop one-on-one relationships with students.

Students in fifth grade are offered opportunities to attend middle school information sessions both on our campus and as field trips on-site.

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

Marion County uses a variety of source data to progress monitor students. All data is warehoused in Unify which allows for easy disaggregation by ethnicity, socio-economics, ELL, ESE, teacher and course. This data includes State/District Assessments (FSA, QSMA's, CMSA's, iReady and Write Score Assessments) as well as local assessments (Document Based Questions, etc.). Unify is also used for teacher comparisons by student, standard, and demographics. School and district are able to compare data as well as similar schools across the State.

Discipline data is housed in the Student Management System(SMS) and can be disaggregated using an internal software (Custom Reports).

Tiered data can be found in Unify where intervention tier is identified and progress monitoring notes are documented. Additional information can be found in course selection for Reading Intervention at the Secondary level in SMS. Teachers also keep data notebooks with individualized student information relative to the progress within the relative tier of intervention.

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.

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

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

Madison Street has two business partnerships. Dr. Jones Dentistry and Regions Bank. These partnerships allow Madison Street to highlight both college and career pathways to both of these industries.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Incorporating a higher level of rigor into classroom instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00