

Marion County Public Schools

Dr N H Jones 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Dr N H Jones Elementary School

1900 SW 5TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Hensel

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2019

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)	68%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (83%) 2017-18: A (81%) 2016-17: A (86%) 2015-16: A (85%) 2014-15: A (96%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Dr N H Jones Elementary School

1900 SW 5TH 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 KG-5	No	34%
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.

In an innovative environment, students will excel in basic academics with enhanced learning in STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Mathematics).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dr. N. H. Jones Elementary, where every child will achieve academic excellence.

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
Houle, Jennifer	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -monitor data -coach teachers on instructional practices -lead grade level discussions -determine school wide needs based on data -determine professional development needs of the school
Coleman, Lisa	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -monitor data -coach teachers on instructional practices -lead grade level discussions -assist with MTSS
Abbruzzi, Julie	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -assist with socio-emotional needs of students -assist with MTSS -assist with IEP/EP compliance
Hall, Carol	Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -monitor student behavior -provide assistance to teachers with classroom management plans and interventions

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	142	117	108	103	108	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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)

38

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/12/2019

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

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

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

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

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

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

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	91%	47%	57%	96%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	78%	56%	58%	81%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	77%	52%	53%	81%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	93%	51%	63%	97%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	58%	62%	78%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	49%	51%	74%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	90%	47%	53%	98%	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	142 (0)	117 (0)	108 (0)	103 (0)	108 (0)	105 (0)	683 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
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)	3 (0)	3 (2)	4 (4)	10 (6)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	91%	44%	47%	58%	33%
	2018	93%	46%	47%	57%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	94%	49%	45%	58%	36%
	2018	92%	43%	49%	56%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	90%	45%	45%	56%	34%
	2018	92%	46%	46%	55%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	95%	49%	46%	62%	33%
	2018	94%	48%	46%	62%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	54%	35%	64%	25%
	2018	90%	47%	43%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	95%	45%	50%	60%	35%
	2018	98%	50%	48%	61%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	90%	44%	46%	53%	37%
	2018	89%	49%	40%	55%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	70										

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	100	78		100	91		100				
BLK	74	71	62	78	66	55	70				
HSP	95	93		100	93						
MUL	83			75							
WHT	96	79	83	96	82	73	94				
FRL	80	78	54	79	72	61	74				
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	90		100	85		100				
BLK	73	53	58	76	53	67	53				
HSP	100	80		100	90						
WHT	95	76	73	97	73	80	93				
FRL	80	60	60	84	59	72	72				
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
ASN	100	86		100	77		100				
BLK	85	76	78	93	73	67	94				
HSP	94	86		94	86						
WHT	98	82	80	98	79	73	98				
FRL	88	73	69	90	70	60	100				

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	83
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	581
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	70

Students With Disabilities	
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	94
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	68
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	79
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	86
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	71
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 performance area was learning gains for the bottom quartile in math. Limited differentiation to target the needs of the math students in the bottom quartile may have contributed to this being the lowest area of performance.

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 was learning gains for the bottom quartile in math. Limited differentiation to target the needs of the math students in the bottom quartile may have contributed to this being the lowest area of performance.

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.

We are above the state average in all areas. The subject with the largest gap is Science. We are above the state average by 37%.

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

We increased by 11% in the math learning gains category. We had data driven conversations regarding students scores and what was required to receive a learning gain. This was accomplished through bi-weekly collaboration meetings.

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

N/A

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

1. Differentiation and support for students in the bottom quartile.
2. Differentiation and support for students to make a learning gain.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Increase Learning Gains in Math Bottom Quartile
Rationale	We lost ground in the gains from our bottom quartile students in Math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we provide targeted and specific differentiated instruction, then we will increase our Math bottom quartile by 10 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our teachers will collaborate weekly with administration and their peers to create standards based lessons and plan small group differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will look at data and collaborate together and plan based on student need weekly.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Weekly Collaborative planning meetings with each grade level. 2. PMP meetings to discuss student progress and interventions (3x year). 3. Support in collaborative planning sessions from district as needed. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase Learning Gains in ELA
Rationale	We went up 4% in learning gains for reading, however we want to continue to make learning gains for all learners.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we provide targeted and specific differentiated instruction, then we will increase our ELA learning gains by 10 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carol Hall (carol.hall@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our teachers will collaborate weekly with administration and their peers to create standards based lessons and plan small group differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will look at data and collaborate together and plan based on student need weekly.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Weekly Collaborative planning meetings with each grade level. 2. PMP meetings to discuss student progress and interventions (3x year). 3. Support in collaborative planning sessions from district as needed. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

We are not a Title I school, but are a magnet school and have outstanding parent involvement. Every year during the second week of school, we have a huge open house for our kindergarten parents. Each teacher prepares a power point presentation and discusses curriculum and kindergarten activities for the entire school year. Each class usually has almost 100% participation.

After Labor Day we have Open House for grades 1-5, which also has a large participation rate. Classes throughout the year have special parent involvement events that provide parents many opportunities to visit and be present at the school.

Parents are also kept informed by attending regularly scheduled parent/teacher conferences. Parents

will continue to be kept informed of their child's progress through Family Access, Parent-Teacher conferences (face to face or phone), progress reports, and report cards. Teachers also provide parents with daily notes concerning behavior or an academic notification.

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.

Our School Counselor is always accessible to all of the students. Teachers will solicit her help to counsel students who are having academic struggles, having social issues, and/or having family issues. We also have a very active mentoring program. One of our Parent Volunteers, along with our Student Services Manager, coordinates the program. Mentors are also trained before being allowed to mentor a student. Many mentors have followed their student from Kindergarten through 5th grade.

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

Although we do not have a head start or a VPK program, we do work with private providers in facilitating the transitioning of our PreKindergarten students into our school. Private providers are scheduled to bring their students for Kindergarten classroom visits. During these visits students observe current Kindergarten students interacting with each other and teachers. We also have frequent parent meetings and after the first week of school, we have a special orientation evening for just our kindergarten parents.

Our 5th grade students meet together in an assembly with administration and Guidance Department from Howard Middle School. At that time rules, procedures, and questions/answers are discussed for their 6th grade program. Articulation meetings are held for our ESE students.

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 consistently monitors student achievement data and provides intervention opportunities to students as needed. Frequent MTSS meetings are conducted to monitor targeted students' academic performance. Data results from classroom assessments, districts assessments, and teacher observations are compiled to ensure appropriate interventions are working. If data is not indicating evidence of success, new strategies will be developed.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI): Dropout prevention and academic intervention programs are funded through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) and Supplemental Academic Instruction categorical funds. Dr. N. H. Jones Elementary uses its SAI dollars to fund the Dean and Guidance Counselor positions to provide both social and emotional support to our students.

Exceptional Students Education: The Florida Diagnostic Learning Resource System is funded through EHA-Part B as amended by PL94-142, to provide Support Services to Exceptional Student Education Programs.

Health Department: District and schools coordinate with the Health Department for Absences Programs, Asthma Programs and Nurses that oversee our school health clinic.

Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten Program: State funded Pre-K programs are advertised to encourage parents to take advantage of this readiness program.

Law Enforcement - Ocala Police Department and Marion County Sheriff's Department: Dr. N. H. Jones participates in the Drug Awareness Resistance Education (D. A. R. E.) program annually that is sponsored by the local Ocala Police Department.

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 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-5) and subject so they will be prepared to succeed in college, careers and life.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Learning Gains in Math Bottom Quartile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Learning Gains in ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00