

Marion County Public Schools

Maplewood Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Maplewood Elementary School

4751 SE 24TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christine Carter

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: B (58%)
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	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Maplewood Elementary School

4751 SE 24TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[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 PK-5	Yes	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

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.

Maplewood is a school where all children can learn and develop to their fullest potential. Each student's success is based upon the school, home, and community working side by side to ensure that each child will become a life-long learner and develop a sense of self worth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Side by Side For Success.

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
DiSanza, Christine	Principal	
Martin, James	Assistant Principal	
Hodges, Phyllis	Instructional Coach	
Hipke, Beth	Instructional Coach	
Gravel, Rebecca	School Counselor	
Hilton, Kelly	School Counselor	
Guynn, Shay	Assistant Principal	

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	77	117	100	120	120	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	15	7	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	4	4	2	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	7	10	16	22	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	48	30	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	17	20	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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)

64

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/25/2019

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	7	8	4	14	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	4	14	10	15	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	6	6	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	69	55	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185

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	1	17	10	19	29	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	7	8	4	14	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	4	14	10	15	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	6	6	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	69	55	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185

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	1	17	10	19	29	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	46%	47%	57%	58%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	67%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	52%	53%	51%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	51%	63%	62%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	58%	62%	71%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	49%	51%	62%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	47%	53%	51%	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	77 (0)	117 (0)	100 (0)	120 (0)	120 (0)	139 (0)	673 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (7)	15 (8)	15 (4)	7 (14)	13 (7)	12 (6)	62 (46)
One or more suspensions	4 (4)	4 (14)	2 (10)	2 (15)	9 (16)	8 (18)	29 (77)
Course failure in ELA or Math	10 (0)	7 (3)	10 (6)	16 (6)	22 (5)	11 (10)	76 (30)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	48 (69)	30 (55)	21 (61)	99 (185)

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	41%	44%	-3%	58%	-17%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	49%	0%	58%	-9%
	2018	47%	43%	4%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	54%	45%	9%	56%	-2%
	2018	49%	46%	3%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	49%	1%	62%	-12%
	2018	52%	48%	4%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	54%	8%	64%	-2%
	2018	65%	47%	18%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	54%	45%	9%	60%	-6%
	2018	51%	50%	1%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	44%	12%	53%	3%
	2018	50%	49%	1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	18	51	46	26	36	14	22				
ELL	41	82		59	45						
BLK	29	59	60	41	57	41	15				
HSP	40	78		45	33		50				
MUL	50	64		59	71						
WHT	52	57	39	60	56	18	62				
FRL	35	52	50	41	49	34	30				
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	14	22	25	24	34	31	17				
ELL	25			42							
BLK	27	36	29	35	45	40	20				
HSP	43	45		37	28		48				
MUL	52	46		62	62						
WHT	51	50	50	63	57	32	55				
FRL	37	42	33	45	47	42	36				

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	20	58	50	25	59	50	19				
ELL	55	69		60	62						
BLK	36	62	46	41	60	53	41				
HSP	50	56		51	64		41				
MUL	73			79							
WHT	66	72	55	69	75	67	55				
FRL	43	65	55	51	67	58	40				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	58
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	43
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	49
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	61
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	49
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	42
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.

Our lowest component when factoring school grades was math learning gains in the bottom quartile. Specifically, our fifth grade math scores decreased for all students as compared to the previous year. This is because there was a lack of standard mastery and student remediation of previous skills

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

The greatest decline from the prior year is our math learning gains from our bottom quartile of students. This is because there was a lack of standard mastery and student remediation of previous skills

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 when compared to the state average is again, our math learning gains for our bottom quartile of students. This is because there was a lack of standard mastery and student remediation of previous skills.

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

The data component showing most improvement is our ELA learning gains. This is because we had a school-wide focus on literacy and standards focused instruction. Professional development was built around best practices in literacy and teaching reading standards.

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

Looking at the Early Warning data, an area of concern would be the number of students in third and fourth grade with course failures. This data reflects a need for remediation and intervention to close the gap so students can master current grade level standards.

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

1. Raising math learning gains in our bottom quartile
2. Raising ELA proficiency in all grade levels
3. Maintaining and raising learning gains in ELA and math
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Small Group Differentiated Instruction in Math
Rationale	If students receive small group differentiated instruction in math, then learning gains for the bottom quartile and students with disabilities will increase because gaps will close.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we provide teachers with supported collaboration opportunities focusing on data collection and analysis, standards based lesson planning, differentiated instruction with manipulatives, and design of formative assessments, then math learning gains will increase from 31%-41% in 4th and 5th grade as indicated on the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group differentiated instruction with manipulatives
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction is where teachers are able to differentiate learning for students. Standards can be remediated based on individual need. Small group instruction is also where teachers can do formative assessments to determine if current standards are being mastered or if intervention is needed. Math manipulatives can be used to support both intervention and remediation.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development on teaching math in small groups 2. Training on designing quick, appropriate, formative assessments 3. Manipulatives available for all teachers to use in the classroom 4. Classroom observation to determine fidelity and follow through 5.
Person Responsible	Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Reading, Writing, and Discussing in all Content Areas
Rationale	If we focus on reading, writing, and discussing content across all academic subjects, student proficiency in ELA Math, and Science will increase school-wide.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we provide teachers with professional development focusing on how to integrate literacy across content areas, active learning, student collaboration, and immediate feedback then proficiency will increase in ELA from 46% to 49%, in Math from 55%-58% and in Science from 53%to 56% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment and the FCAT.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Math Talks Kagan Structures Opinion Based Writing
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Reading, writing and having content-rich discussions with and among students increases vocabulary, comprehension of content, and the ability to analyze and synthesize information.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development on Kagan Structures 2. Classroom modeling of math talks 3. All teachers (including math/science) attend writing training 4. Follow through by instructional coaches and administrators to provide feedback and determine next steps 5.
Person Responsible	Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Parent Engagement
Rationale	When parents are engaged in their children's education, students have better attendance, learn to read faster, and perform better on statewide assessments.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If parents are engaged through a variety of school events including information about academics and how to help their child succeed, then learning gains will increase from 60% to 63% in ELA and 55% to 58% in math as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Plan events at different times of the day to accommodate family schedules Offer information nights about curriculum used and standards taught at each grade level Showcase student work and how it aligns with the Florida Standards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If events are planned at various times throughout the year focusing on both student work and standards being taught, parents will become familiar with what their children are learning in school and how to support their learning at home.
Action Step	
Description	1. Use surveys to determine parent needs 2. Plan events throughout the year to encourage family engagement in education 3. Conduct follow up surveys to determine success of events and future planning 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Christine DiSanza (christine.disanza@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).

The leadership team will continue to monitor the progress of our areas of focus and share feedback on these areas during weekly leadership meetings. Additionally, other school-wide initiatives and professional development focuses will be led by instructional coaches and assistant principals.

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.

Maplewood Elementary staff and school personnel will work together to increase our parent involvement and build relationships with families through the use of the parent portal, parent nights, timely responses to all parent requests (i.e. meeting, calls, emails), and SKYLERT messages.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

Maplewood has two school counselors equipped to provide social-emotional groups, individual sessions, and/or other related services. The school counseling department has referral resources to also assist in meeting student social-emotional needs based on the individual needs of each child. School staff inclusive of the administration, Dean, volunteers and the like can and have provided mentoring services for students in need. Maplewood also participates in a grant funded program titled Project About School Safety Interconnected Systems Framework. This program allows for a mental health clinician to support the students by providing individual, group and full-class interventions. The clinician is available several days a week and works with students identified and recommended by classroom teachers.

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 to assist Pre-K and Kindergarten students in transitioning into local elementary schools. Six students per day (per classroom) attend the first 3 days of school giving staff the opportunity to administer assessments, develop a one-on-one relationship with students, as well as reducing any anxiety students may experience. I-ready and FLKRS are measurement tools used to determine readiness needs. Florida's Voluntary Pre-K, Headstart, and HIPPY (Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters) are programs currently implemented throughout the district to assist preschools 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. When students enter Kindergarten they are assessed on seven developmental areas during FLKRS testing. The Kindergarten teachers are responsible for implementing the instructional strategies relevant to the individual needs of our Kindergarten students.

For outgoing 5th grade students, ahead of closing the school year, a field trip is scheduled at the two different middle schools based on the students school attendance zone. The school develops a list based on student residence for which school the student will visit. During the visit students tour the campus, meet school administrative and guidance staff. This process helps to prepare students for transitioning to the middle school level and helps to reduce student anxiety.

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 Synergy Team, comprised of school based Administration, Student Service Manager, CASs, district level staff; school psychologist, Behavior Specialist and social worker, will meet on a monthly basis to discuss the needs of the school. This team also functions as the MTSS core team and reviews varying data inclusive of universal screener (I-Ready, EWS, ODRs, Attendance...); will monitor the effectiveness of intervention programs by evaluating the data collection of school-wide universal screeners, as well as student group data.

Title I

Part A- Title I funds are provided to support after-school tutoring. Funds from federal, state and local programs such as: IDEA-funding paraprofessionals; Title I- funding staff development, personnel, and materials; Title VI- Red Ribbon; and Voluntary Pre-K program through the Early Learning Coalition are integrated to meet all student needs.

Part C- Migrant- District funds are used to purchase:

- ~ School supplies
- ~ Provide an After School Tutorial Program to improve grades, increase promotion, improve attendance and reduce the dropout rate.

Title II

Part A- District provides staff development activities to improve basic educational programs and to assist administrators and teachers in meeting state certified status. District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education through the purchase of equipment to supplemental education programs. Technology in the classroom that will increase the instructional strategies provided to students and for Instructional software that will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling and early childhood students.

Title III

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

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social service referrals) for students identified homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

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

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.

Maplewood students participate in the STEAM showcase which promotes science for all students. Also, students participate in career day research where they learn about jobs in the community. Members of the community come speak to students and answer questions pertaining to their job.