

Marion County Public Schools

# Marion Charter School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

# Marion Charter School

39 CEDAR RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Michelle Axson**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/8/2013

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (58%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)<br>2016-17: C (53%)<br>2015-16: B (59%)<br>2014-15: C (52%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |

\* 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

# Marion Charter School

39 CEDAR RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School<br/>KG-5</p> | <p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p> | <p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">92%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">60%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> | <b>2015-16</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | B              | C              | C              | B              |

## 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.**

At Marion Charter School, we will strive to guide students to become respectful citizens, successful problem solvers, and life long learners who value themselves and others.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

At Marion Charter School, we envision a school that supports and nourishes the unique personality and gifts of each child, where students and staff members greet each day with enthusiasm, and where success and challenges are expected and enjoyed.

### 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 |
|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Axson, Michelle  | Principal        |                                 |
| Wells, Valerie   | School Counselor |                                 |
| Hinerman, Alison | Teacher, K-12    |                                 |

### 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 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 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  | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

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

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

**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  | 0     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/8/2019

**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     | 3           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

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

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

**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     | 3           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

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

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

**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             | 59%    | 47%      | 57%   | 61%    | 52%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 65%    | 56%      | 58%   | 63%    | 57%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 42%    | 52%      | 53%   | 53%    | 53%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 70%    | 51%      | 63%   | 63%    | 52%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 60%    | 58%      | 62%   | 54%    | 54%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 53%    | 49%      | 51%   | 28%    | 43%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 56%    | 47%      | 53%   | 47%    | 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     | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 (3)                             | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (2) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (7) |
| 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) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**

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

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

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 59%    | 44%      | 15%                        | 58%   | 1%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 58%    | 46%      | 12%                        | 57%   | 1%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 61%    | 49%      | 12%                        | 58%   | 3%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 43%    | 43%      | 0%                         | 56%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 18%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 59%    | 45%      | 14%                        | 56%   | 3%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 48%    | 46%      | 2%                         | 55%   | -7%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 73%    | 49%      | 24%                        | 62%   | 11%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 72%    | 48%      | 24%                        | 62%   | 10%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 67%    | 54%      | 13%                        | 64%   | 3%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 64%    | 47%      | 17%                        | 62%   | 2%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 70%    | 45%      | 25%                        | 60%   | 10%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 77%    | 50%      | 27%                        | 61%   | 16%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 57%    | 44%      | 13%                        | 53%   | 4%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 68%    | 49%      | 19%                        | 55%   | 13%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 35       | 50     |             | 61        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 57       | 50     |             | 63        | 63      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 61       | 71     |             | 70        | 53      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 63       | 71     |             | 73        | 61      |              | 71       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 60       | 65     | 40          | 70        | 59      |              | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |

  

| 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       | 7      |             | 36        | 47      |              | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 38       | 21     |             | 52        | 43      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 21       | 15     |             | 68        | 69      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 61       | 38     |             | 78        | 74      |              | 69       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 48       | 35     | 15          | 73        | 73      | 50           | 64       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 41       | 36     |             | 35        | 45      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 59       | 79     |             | 55        | 57      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 42       | 63     |             | 58        | 47      |              | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 71       | 58     |             | 69        | 58      |              | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 62       | 59     | 55          | 68        | 61      | 29           | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |

**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  | 58  |
| 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                                       | 405 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 49 |
| 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   |     |
| 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                                    | 58  |
| 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  | 64  |
| 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   | 68  |
| 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                                | 58  |
| 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 5th grade Science scores dropped from 66% in 2018 to 56% in 2019. Our 5th Math scores dropped from 77% in 2018 to 70% in 2019. Some contributing factors may be teacher preparedness and lack of teacher resources. We had a new teacher in one of our 5th grade classes.

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

Our 5th grade Science scores drop from 66% in 2018 to 56% in 2019. Some contributing factors may be teacher preparedness and lack of teacher resources. We had a new teacher in one of our 5th grade classes.

**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 scores for all grade levels in reading, math, and science surpassed the state's scores.

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

Our learning gains in ELA showed the most growth. We had our ESE/Gifted/RTI aide provide additional remediation support above the standard MTSS support. She worked with 3rd-5th graders on a daily basis.

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

We are continuing to work on decreasing the number of absences and tardies at our school.

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

1. Increase out 5th grade Science Scores overall.
2. Continue to increase our Math Scores overall, especially for our Math Learning Gains.
3. Increase our Writing Scores overall.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>#1</b>   |  |
| <b>Title</b>  | Standards-based instruction  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | A downward trend in student achievement in Science, as well as a drop in Math achievement and learning gains measured by FSA and NGSS data, demonstrates a weakness in standards based instructional practice.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | If teachers implement effective standards based instruction in Science and Math, then student learning gains and proficiencies will increase by at least 10%.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Collaborative planning using Florida State Standards to support standards based instruction, as well continuing to provide additional remediation support to our 3rd-5th grade teachers.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | This strategy was implemented last year in reading, which contributed to our continued growth. We will now implement this in all academic areas.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide continued professional development to our teachers and aides.</li> <li>2. Schedule collaborative planning times for grade levels in order to develop strong lessons and activities.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)   |

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| <b>#2</b>        |  |
| <b>Title</b>     | Parent and Family Engagement   |
| <b>Rationale</b> | In order to try to accommodate all parents, especially the parents who still could not attend due to work or personal schedules, we will continue to offer multiple days and times for all of our meetings. We will also post the information on our website; school based social media page, and DOJO. We will also try this year to post videos/webinars of the information that was given at the meetings so that parents can view at their earliest convenience. |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | If we focus parent and family engagement activities on ELA, Math, and Science standards and build a strong foundation for two-way communication with families, then student learning gains will increase based on local assessments and diagnostic data. |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | We sent out a survey to parents to see how we can better serve them, and it was stated that we should have more parent nights.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Parents stated that they would benefit from attending more hands-on classes or meetings to learn how to help their children at home with their academic class and homework.  |

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Step</b>        |  |
| <b>Description</b>        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide hands on meetings for parents and students for Math Night, Reading Night, and Science Night.</li> <li>2. Provide parents with many forms of communication such as our webiste, DOJO, Facebook, etc.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@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).**

We will continue to provide Professional Development opportunities to all of our teachers and staff. We will continue to meet with our teachers on a bi-weekly basis to discuss data, as well as providing the teachers will additional remediation support. We will also pass this information on to our parents through several hands on Parent Nights for reading, math, and science.

**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.**

Marion Charter provides several opportunities throughout the school year in order for parents and families to volunteer. We hold annual Title I parent meetings, Open House, as well as Reading and Math FSA and Science FCAT presentations to the families of 3rd-5th graders. We also hold several afterschool carnivals in which the families participate and volunteer for, as well as requiring our parents to meet with their child's teacher at least 3 times during the school year. In the 2017-18 school year, we had 95% of our parents/grandparents attend the required parent conferences and 50 parents/grandparents who volunteered, representing about 60% of our school families. Marion Charter tries to make helpful connections with the parents and guardians and encourages them to be actively involved. Strategies include making initial phone calls to invite parents/guardians out to meet with the teacher and counselor and following up with suggestions and materials to support the family. Marion Charter School uses Edline and Skyward as our parent connection tools. Parents can access their child's grades, assignments and support materials through the parent website. Parents are given an access code that they can activate to allow them access to grades and class information. Additionally, all forms from school, including field trip permission forms, class and school newsletters, calendars, etc are all found at our website. It is a one stop place for all information about the school. Marion Charter also has a Parent Resource Room where parents/guardians are allowed to check out resources such as games, manipulatives, and workbooks, to use at home with their children. We are also starting our PTO back up this year as another way to get parents involved in their child's education.

#### **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.**

School counselors are vital members of the educational team. They help all students in areas of academic achievement, personal/social development and career development. School counseling programs are essential for students to achieve optimal personal growth, acquire positive social skills and values, set appropriate career goals, and realize full academic potential. Our goal is to enable our students to become productive, contributing members of the community with an appreciation and acceptance of diversity. Marion Charter School's Guidance Counselor works as a team with the school staff, parents, and the community in order to create a caring climate and atmosphere. By providing education, prevention, early identification and intervention, our school counselor, Ms. Wells can help all students achieve academic, emotional, and behavioral success. Ms. Wells meets with parents and teachers in order to assess a student's social and emotional needs. She provides individual, as well as, classroom guidance sessions, pairs students with both adult and student mentors. If needed, Ms. Wells refers students to additional programs or services in order to meet the needs of all of our students.

#### **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 Pre-Kindergarten students into our school. We have frequent parent meetings and prior to the first week of school, we have a special orientation for just our Kindergarten parents. We



also meet one-on-one with incoming students and their parents to help so that we can provide strategies to use with their children to improve their readiness skills. Families with pre-school children are provided materials to help their child transition to the elementary school level. Our guidance counselor is available to parents to answer questions and meet with them to help their child make a smooth transition to school. Over the summer before they enroll in kindergarten, informational literature is mailed to all incoming kindergarten students. Information is available to parents to inform them about VPK for younger siblings.

**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 MTSS team meets during pre-school to prepare student folders from the prior year and review incoming cumulative folders to flag students who may need additional support. Teachers receive folders showing last year's interventions and performance data for their students who were in the RTI process. Our ESE consultant meets with classroom teachers during the first 2 weeks of school to review the folders. During the first 2 weeks of school, students may be identified as needing additional support based on last year's end of year data or beginning of the year assessment testing. After the initial 2 week review, the MTSS/RTI team is called to review the students who are struggling and initial interventions are created and implemented. Teachers begin graphing data (1 data point per week) in the areas of concern. This data will be evaluated at least three times per year during child study team meetings of the MTSS/RTI team. The MTSS/RTI leadership team provides data to the our School Advisory Council, which, as a charter school, is our Board of Directors, in regular Board meetings. Data from the MTSS/RTI process is used to guide budget decisions on materials and staff professional development.

#### Title I, Part A

Our Title 1 funds provide 2 teacher paraprofessionals to work with our students in reading and math.

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant

Currently we do not have any migrant students. If migrant students do enroll, we will utilize the services provided by the district to assist the student. These services include school supplies and a migrant liaison who works with families to provide referrals to services available to them.

#### Title II

The Marion County School District provides a variety of staff development activities that our staff can access, including training in new curriculums, using technology and serving students with special needs.

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

Marion Charter School, as well as all Marion County Public Schools implement 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 that 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: Standards-based instruction  | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Parent and Family Engagement | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |