

Marion County Public Schools

Francis Marion Military Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Francis Marion Military Academy

5895 SE 83RD ST, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: James Mccollum

Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2019-12-16
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (36%) 2014-15: D (36%)
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

N/A

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	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Francis Marion Military Academy

5895 SE 83RD ST, Ocala, FL 34472

[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)
High School 9-12	Yes	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	47%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Our mission at Marion Military Academy from 2008, the founding of the school states:

To provide high school students an opportunity to secure the highest quality education in an environment that embraces core military values.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Marion Military Academy will establish an educational environment that addresses both district and state academic standards, while providing all students a unique, military-style educational experience. By incorporating JROTC military principles throughout the school environment, the academy will instill in students the importance of self-discipline, integrity and honor. Graduates from the academy will become the meaningful contributors to our community and our country.

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
McCollum, James	Principal	
Adair, Tommy	Administrative Support	

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	0	0	0	0	48	57	44	29	178
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	16	10	8	47
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	7	21	10	6	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	30	20	17	82

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	8	10	4	2	24

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)

18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

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	9	5	6	2	22
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	7	12	12	12	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	30	15	6	66

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	31	36	29	23	119

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	0	0	0	0	9	5	6	2	22
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	7	12	12	12	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	30	15	6	66

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	31	36	29	23	119

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	37%	46%	56%	29%	43%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	48%	51%	48%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	39%	42%	50%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	27%	40%	51%	15%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	44%	43%	48%	29%	38%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	37%	45%	57%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	38%	61%	68%	40%	59%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	71%	73%	46%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	48 (0)	57 (0)	44 (0)	29 (0)	178 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (9)	16 (5)	10 (6)	8 (2)	47 (22)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	7 (7)	21 (12)	10 (12)	6 (12)	44 (43)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	15 (15)	30 (30)	20 (15)	17 (6)	82 (66)

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
09	2019	33%	50%	-17%	55%	-22%
	2018	18%	46%	-28%	53%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	34%	46%	-12%	53%	-19%
	2018	36%	46%	-10%	53%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	64%	-21%	67%	-24%
2018	52%	61%	-9%	65%	-13%
Compare		-9%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	70%	-8%	70%	-8%
2018	50%	69%	-19%	68%	-18%
Compare		12%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	54%	-23%	61%	-30%
2018	20%	57%	-37%	62%	-42%
Compare		11%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	24%	51%	-27%	57%	-33%
2018	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Compare		-17%			

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	8	33		20	50						
ELL				29							
BLK	10	30									

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
HSP	40	58		26	50			73		70	
WHT	45	51		34	40		53	67			
FRL	34	49	44	27	40		35	61		76	
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	6	38									
BLK	18	70									
HSP	45	47					71	38		60	
WHT	30	44		36	19		45	40		85	18
FRL	28	52	31	15	21		53	45		50	
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		42			36						
ELL					30						
BLK	7	38		13	54						
HSP	33	52		9	27		9	20			
WHT	29	43		20	27		56				
FRL	28	47	53	14	29	52	42	47			

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	48
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	41
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.

All data fields with the exception of two show improvement and the one of those shows only a 1% decrease. That 1%, based on our small school size could be due to a single cadet becoming ill during testing and having to leave the school for the day. This resulted in a very low score from a student who is academically capable. The other low performance was in science achievement and this seems clearly related to our failure to get an effective educator in the classroom throughout this past year. We went through three teachers and have now hired a new educator for this school year.

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

The only area of academic decline is found in science where we struggled to find a quality educator. All other fields show improvement at a range of 5% (Math achievement) to 20% (Math Learning Gains) to 58% (L25 Math). Science proficiency was low due to poor instructional practice and inconsistency of the educator. Those parties are no longer teachers at MMA.

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.

Our Science achievement was 30% below the state's performance. It is clear that this is directly related to instructional deficiencies that were noted on quarterly testing and daily classroom management issues. these resulted in the termination of the educator.

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

We had significant improvement in Math Learning gains, Math L25 gains, ELA Achievement, ELA L25 improvement and social studies. These are directly attributed to teaching strategies, increased literacy expectations using Schmoker's Philosophy around instructional delivery and improved instructional practice in math. We also developed and implemented a Literacy Canon of required in school reading and a structured essay process that was implemented vertically throughout the humanities program. This resulted in increased performance throughout the year on quarter exams

as well as the state assessment. In the area of math, we replaced an educator and refocused on core areas of the curriculum to help students capture areas of learning that were clearly missed. As we work with a population that is academically at-risk, this format resulted in quick gains and increased proficiency but we have work to do in math to enhance our overall achievement levels. They went up 5% from the previous year but have a long way to go.

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

Our students come to our school after having negative experiences at their previous program. A "military" school is often perceived of as a program that instills discipline. Based on that perception, many of our students and families have multiple risk factors. Our performance this past year is indicative of our effectiveness with effective instructional practices in core academic areas that ensure remediation of foundational learning skills. We augment this support by having specific remediation programming throughout the school on Fridays. these days are dedicated to teacher led review of academic work done that week. This has resulted in increased academic success and lower failure rates across our student population.

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

1. Math Proficiency - (added intensive math program to double dose Alg and Geo students; 2019 - 2020
2. ELA Proficiency - (completed canon and revised essay structure rubric; included outline requirement)
3. Science Proficiency (new teacher)
4. Increased structure of Friday remediation
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Numeracy Improvement
Rationale	Math fact fluency, comprehension and numeracy are barriers for our students to perform higher-level math functions and success on standardized achievement test in Algebra and geometry. Additionally, higher-level, advanced math courses have not been offered in the previous year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>If we offer advanced math courses (i.e. pre-calculus) and remediation classes (i.e. Intensive), designed to support students with course level standards in Algebra and Geometry, than we see and increase of at least 7% in Mathematical Proficiency (Achievement), Math learning Gains and Math Bottom Quartile categories as well as an increase for our identified Subgroups.</p> <p>It is our goal to get to 40% (from 27%) in Math Achievement this year</p> <p>It is our goal to get to 55% (from 44%) in Math Learning Gains this year</p> <p>It is our goal to get to 60% (from 58%) in Math Learning Gains this year</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advanced mathematical courses offered will motivate higher-level mathematics students to take more math courses; increasing their math proficiency. 2. Identifying students in Algebra and Geometry who need foundation mathematical concepts and skills and schedule them into additional mathematics using MCPS curriculum. 3. Professional development for teachers focused on unpacking mathematical standards into concepts, skills and application necessary to be successful in the course. <p>Double-dosing of students below proficient on state test through Intensive Math Course</p> <p>Focused instruction on identified standards throughout each term</p> <p>Remediation of Arithmetic skills throughout the year to enhance math comprehension</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting these intervention is based on understanding best practices and understanding the needs of our specific population. The evidence is based on demographic data, quarterly assessment data that defines strengths and deficits in the content area and student performance in the classroom.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offer six sections of intensive math and select students who at least earned a Level 1, and Level 2 on prior year's FSA or FSA EOC for mathematics. 2. With teachers, analyze the reporting categories for math and identify standards deficiency in prior year. Design instruction map for intensive classes that support deficient standards. 3. Bi-weekly meeting with leadership team and math teachers. <p>A. Data analysis and data chat meetings for student progress monitor and SIP goal evaluation.</p> <p>B. Professional learning community focusing on unpacking standards and backwards design lesson planing for learning targets based on the standards.</p> <p>4. Ensure remediation on Fridays enables students to revisit content that has not been mastered</p>
Person Responsible	James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Literacy Improvement
Rationale	Although MMA ELA student learning gains is consistent with district percentages, ELA achievement is still well below. With the additional time and support implemented in the 18-19 school year, students made progress towards mastering standards, especially our subgroup students, but falling short of mastery for graduation requirements. Given the additional support and structure, this year will focus on collaboration and planning.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	IF MMA Teachers focuses on collaborative planning with a focus on standards, data analysis and implementation of cooperative learning strategies in the classroom, then we will see an increase of at least 7% in the area of ELA Student Achievement, ELA Gains and in ELA L25 as well as an increase in our lowest subgroup population.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common grading rubric and calibration exercise between teachers. 2. Cooperative Learning Strategies. 3. Common Planning. <p>Reading....Schmoker espouses "read-discuss-write" as a primary way to increase learning and also increase literacy skills. This process includes "discuss" and that is a primary tool in developing students meta-cognitive skills related to understanding and increasing complexity of how knowledge is integrated and used. Since introducing these concepts last year, our humanities department has created a "Literacy Canon" of novels that all students access at MMA. These are read and discussed IN CLASS and writing is a component of all assessments in these areas. These tools are benefiting our students literacy skills as measured on county and state assessments as well as in our regular grading program.</p> <p>Common essay rubric with OUTLINING is also a technique we have implemented and are continuing to modify as we work to ensure all students understand the fundamentals of writing structure</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>In order for our MMA Cadets to increase confidence, overall school academic performance and reduce the number of absences, a uniform school behavior management system across all teachers and classrooms has been put in place. According to the early warning systems last year there were 47 out of 178 students whose attendance fell below the 90% and 44 course failures were present in ELA or Math. Additionally, almost half of the students scored a Level 1 on statewide assessment. From administration walk through and teacher evaluation data, it was evident that students were not being held to the MMA standards of Cadet Practice and buy in from faculty was lacking. Strengthening both should yield additional student achievement outcomes in Science and Social Studies as well as a reduction in student absences.</p> <p>Upon arriving at MMA, it became clear that educators were working in isolation. There was no continuity in the program. WE built a humanities team and began developing a literacy canon (32 novels that cadets would read and discuss in class between grades 9 - 12) and an essay rubric with outline requirement. WE also developed a vocabulary program that was specific to content in humanities and science. Structured supported reading, guided</p>

reading and CLOSE reading are component parts of these initiatives. The reality that at risk populations are typically well behind their peers in accessible vocabulary also played a role in the development of these programs.

Action Step	
Description	1. Literacy Canon - ensure all booksets are up to date based on class needs and used according to plan
	2. Essay Rubric with OUTLINE requirement - ensure use across Humanities department; communal grading
	3. Vocabulary oversight - access lists from each teacher for each quarter; review instruction and assessment
	4. Lead bi-weekly meetings to ensure participation in steps
	5. Quarterly review of performance using QSMA and FSA - ELA data
Person Responsible	James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Science Achievement Improvement
Rationale	Our score (38%) was 30 points lower than the state this year after a much higher performance (55%) the prior year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If MMA teachers receive initial and on-going professional development rooted around Teach Like a Champion and Focus by Schmoker. Then Early Warning System, Absence Indicator, also working with MCPS and County Social Worker, can reduced by at least 5 students and student achievement will increase by at least 5% on the State Biology Assessment for the School Year 19 - 20.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The teacher is the glue that ensures learning. A teacher who can meaningfully engage students while effectively managing a classroom with effective structures, practices and routines, can transform learning in any content area. Our history last year represents failure in this area.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	An effective teacher is known to impact learning more than any other practice. The tool the principal is using initially is Teach Like a Champion by Doug Lemov. This book provides explicit techniques that ensure quality classroom management if practiced with fidelity. This training will be ongoing bi-weekly throughout the school year. The teacher will also receive training based on the educational philosophy of Schmoker as explained in the book, Focus.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development in classroom management 2. Regular classroom walk-throughs 3. Review of performance data quarterly based on QSMA, State assessment and internal assessments 4. 5.
Person Responsible	James McCollum (james.mccollum@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 final area that comes to mind in relation to our schools state scoring relates to acceleration points. MMA scored a zero this past year and will score a zero for the upcoming school year. WE did, however, improve our score to a "C" for the first time in 6 years. We are confident that this occurred due to the practices we set in place last year and are only now becoming proficient in as we begin our second year. WE also had low teacher turnover this year after severing ties with a significant number of teachers during and at the end of last year. Our new focus on academic performance would not be real if we did not enable students to access programming with greater rigor. Although our student body enters our program decidedly as academically at risk youth, by the second year, based on this years evidence, they are demonstrating they can academically excel and desire to do so. We are proud to have a pre-calc program for the first year and have increased our "Honors" programming.

We have also succeeded in sending 5 upperclassmen to dual enrollment classes taught at the local community college. Finally, we have 70 cadets enrolled in certificate programs relating to Adobe and Microsoft. This programming is in its first year and we will be committing ourselves to their success and the growth of this program. All of these programs require students to be committed themselves, and that will be based on the culture we create. The continued focus on Academic Excellence must move forward and all staff must recognize it and believe it if we are going to move students toward it. So far that is happening. The evidence will be in how many students pass their dual enrollment course and how many cadets successfully certify in the tech based courses this year.

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.

The school's mission, vision, and events are communicated to parents through the school website, social media accounts, Parent to Parent meetings, Open House and State of the School Presentation. The school will hold orientation, weekend picnics, and movie nights in order to foster a positive relationship with families and encourage involvement. Parents are encouraged to serve as school volunteers and chaperones in order to remain engaged and informed of their child's progress.

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.

- * Student Leadership Cadre provides mentoring and peer counseling
- * Check-in/Check-out system for select students
- * Mentors assigned to select students
- * The nature of the JROTC is inclusive and creates a team environment where all students feel a sense of belonging and have an adult mentor and peer mentors.
- * Providing 504 plans, Individual Education Plans (IEP), and Behavior Intervention Plans (BIP)
- * Utilization of Behavior Specialist, Student Services, Social Workers, School Psychologist, and other district staff as necessary.
- * As a small school that has a focus on both team and leadership, our behavior rubric is inclusive of empathy and caring for one another. This is reinforced daily in our formations and classes.

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

- Francis Marion Charter Middle School, continues to be a feeder school to the high school.
- FMCMS and several other middle schools are visited to recruit students to attend MMA.
- We also recruit students with bilingual brochures to eligible eighth and ninth grade students.
- Transition of new students is facilitated by attending KIT (knowledge in training) camp, orientation and peer mentoring.
- MMA also has colleges visit, offers dual enrollment and promotes seeking a college education to its

students.

The JROTC establishes student mentors for each entering cadet and serve on remediation days to support students academically.

- MMA administers the ASVAB to all eligible students.
- MMA supports all military recruiters visiting the school and giving the students opportunity to explore different branches.
- MMA offers multiple opportunities to take the SAT, ACT and PERT assessment to ensure students meet academic requirement related to education.

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 will consistently monitor student achievement data and provide intervention opportunities to students as needed.
- Progress will be monitored and interventions will be adjusted based on student growth data.
- The school based team identifies areas in need of improvement and sets annual goals.
- An action plan is then created to address each goal area.
- The team meets periodically to set individual goals for students and to monitor student growth.
- Teachers are included in conversations about student growth and their professional growth needs are identified and prioritized through these conversations and results of team meetings.
- Data is consistently analyzed to adjust the action plan and to address new areas of need.
- E-Mail dissemination following each of the teacher meeting's
- The team reviews data from QSMA quarterly to measure improvement, identify areas of strength and weakness and plan improvement to instructional delivery that will address deficit areas.

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

- College visits and Dual Enrollment Opportunities
- ASVAB administration to all eligible students.
- Military recruiter visits which give students the opportunity to explore different branches.
- The principal shall review each seniors transcript with the student and discuss goals and aspirations at the beginning and midpoint of the school year
- The guidance counselor will provide formal presentation of Florida scholarships at the midpoint of junior year and the beginning of senior year to each appropriate class
- MMA offers multiple opportunities to take ACT, PSAT / SAT and PERT throughout the year
- A parent information evening will occur to provide parents and students information regarding college access and financial processes that assist in affording post-secondary education.
- The principal is working with the staff to develop curricula programs that offer honors by contract to prepare students demonstrating strong academic for dual enrollment

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Numeracy Improvement				\$14,589.75
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2110	100-Salaries	9690 - Francis Marion Military Academy	Title, I Part A		\$14,589.75
			<i>Notes: Tutor/Teacher Numeracy Improvement</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Literacy Improvement				\$22,926.75
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2110	100-Salaries	9690 - Francis Marion Military Academy	Title, I Part A		\$22,926.75
			<i>Notes: ELA Tutor's and Certified Teachers</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement Improvement				\$4,168.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2110	100-Salaries	9690 - Francis Marion Military Academy	Title, I Part A		\$4,168.50
			<i>Notes: Tutoring</i>			
Total:						\$42,080.00