

Marion County Public Schools

# Fort McCoy School



2020-21 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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

## Fort McCoy School

16160 NE HIGHWAY 315, Fort Mc Coy, FL 32134

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

**Principal: Jordan Surdam**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (42%)
<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>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

## Fort McCoy School

16160 NE HIGHWAY 315, Fort Mc Coy, FL 32134

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	12%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

### 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.**

At Fort McCoy School, the staff works together in an environment of mutual respect and understanding toward the common goal of preparing students for a lifetime of learning, productive work, and responsible citizenship by serving the learning needs of the community in both traditional and innovative ways.

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

Fort McCoy School, working together as partners with the total community, will prepare students for the future. We aim to provide an educational program that is academically challenging that includes meaningful instructional strategies and differentiation for all students. Our educational program engages each student by linking curricular content to previous knowledge and experience while remaining exciting enough to promote further exploration of new ideas. We recognize that we cannot reach our goals without the hard work of our Fort McCoy students, parents, and our community.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Surdam, Jordan	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The Principal supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school.
Dobbins, Matthew	School Counselor	The School Counselor has knowledge and understanding of child development and the unique needs and characteristics of students served. Knowledge and understanding of guidance and counseling principles, programs, and services. Knowledge of tests and measurement theory, and of community resources and services available for student assistance. Ability to counsel and assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in student learning, behavior, and mental health. Ability to administer student assessment and evaluation instruments. Ability to analyze and use data. Ability to verbally communicate and consult with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to maintain sensitivity to multicultural issues.
Favors, Jackie	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) implements disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment.
Taschenberger, Mary	School Counselor	The School Counselor has knowledge and understanding of child development and the unique needs and characteristics of students served. Knowledge and understanding of guidance and counseling principles, programs, and services. Knowledge of tests and measurement theory, and of community resources and services available for student assistance. Ability to counsel and assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in student learning, behavior, and mental health. Ability to administer student assessment and evaluation instruments. Ability to analyze and use data. Ability to verbally communicate and consult with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to maintain sensitivity to multicultural issues.
Ostanik, Eric	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal aids the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
	Psychologist	The School Psychologist has knowledge of child growth and development tests, test and measurement theory and foundations, and community resources and services available for student assistance. Ability to conduct comprehensive psycho-educational evaluations of students. Ability to verbally communicate and consult effectively with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to communicate

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		results of evaluation findings in written reports and correspondence to assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in student learning, behavior, and mental health. Ability to interact successfully with parents, school personnel, and administrators. Skills in communicating effectively orally and in writing. Skills and ability to apply and interpret federal, state, and local laws and policies governing the provision of educational services to students with disabilities. Knowledge of laws and rules relating to education and other services for persons with disabilities.
Elder, Dossella	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal aids the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Blackson, Luke	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) implements disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment.
Hunt, Leona	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/29/2019, Jordan Surdam

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

17

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

65

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (42%)
<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>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	51	73	75	80	82	78	184	161	171	0	0	0	0	955
Attendance below 90 percent	19	25	26	17	24	22	69	58	79	0	0	0	0	339
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	1	1	2	12	9	15	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	1	5	9	11	2	3	16	6	20	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	0	5	9	11	2	3	16	6	20	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	65	51	54	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	52	44	46	0	0	0	0	150

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	5	4	4	14	65	52	74	0	0	0	0	223

**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	5	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

Thursday 7/16/2020

**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	
Number of students enrolled	51	83	81	90	85	113	165	167	181	0	0	0	0	1016
Attendance below 90 percent	22	26	18	17	28	18	37	58	55	0	0	0	0	279
One or more suspensions	2	6	1	3	6	8	16	22	21	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	22	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	44	34	56	70	52	0	0	0	0	267

**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	10	19	21	20	22	35	83	92	109	0	0	0	0	411

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	
Number of students enrolled	51	83	81	90	85	113	165	167	181	0	0	0	0	1016
Attendance below 90 percent	22	26	18	17	28	18	37	58	55	0	0	0	0	279
One or more suspensions	2	6	1	3	6	8	16	22	21	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	22	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	44	34	56	70	52	0	0	0	0	267

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	10	19	21	20	22	35	83	92	109	0	0	0	0	411

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

## 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	40%	42%	61%	44%	43%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	45%	59%	45%	49%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	36%	54%	39%	42%	51%
Math Achievement	38%	41%	62%	45%	40%	58%
Math Learning Gains	45%	51%	59%	52%	54%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	43%	52%	44%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	45%	40%	56%	45%	39%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	49%	53%	78%	49%	54%	75%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(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.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	44%	14%	58%	0%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	34%	49%	-15%	58%	-24%
	2018	44%	43%	1%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	33%	45%	-12%	56%	-23%
	2018	47%	46%	1%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019	38%	45%	-7%	54%	-16%
	2018	44%	44%	0%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
07	2019	36%	46%	-10%	52%	-16%
	2018	41%	43%	-2%	51%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2019	47%	50%	-3%	56%	-9%
	2018	38%	49%	-11%	58%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	49%	-2%	62%	-15%
	2018	40%	48%	-8%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
	2018	33%	47%	-14%	62%	-29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	24%	45%	-21%	60%	-36%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
06	2019	35%	46%	-11%	55%	-20%
	2018	37%	42%	-5%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
07	2019	43%	49%	-6%	54%	-11%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	54%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	30%	41%	-11%	46%	-16%
	2018	38%	43%	-5%	45%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	44%	-6%	53%	-15%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	47%	44%	3%	48%	-1%
	2018	41%	46%	-5%	50%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	65%	-14%	71%	-20%
2018	55%	64%	-9%	71%	-16%
Compare		-4%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	54%	32%	61%	25%
2018	100%	57%	43%	62%	38%
Compare		-14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

## 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	7	35	40	12	40	40	17	29			
HSP	34	49	29	44	50	42	40	82			
MUL	38	30		50	37						
WHT	40	40	33	37	44	36	44	48	46		
FRL	34	40	34	32	44	35	38	45	42		
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	8	29	28	9	36	39	13	17			
HSP	44	55		42	68	83	30	62			
MUL	38	47		50	53						
WHT	43	49	40	42	53	39	42	56	37		
FRL	40	48	38	38	51	43	38	52	32		
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	9	34	44	11	38	37	22	12			
HSP	42	43	38	39	49	31	33	35			
MUL	57	43		52	52						
WHT	43	45	40	45	52	45	45	50	38		
FRL	39	43	40	39	49	40	42	46	36		

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
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	375
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
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%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	41
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## 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.**

According to School Grade Components data, the lowest performing component was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Our students scored 33% proficiency. The subgroups data revealed that the SWD ELA achievement was 7% which contributed to this low score. Some factors that contributed to these non-proficient scores were continuing substitutes in several classrooms and attendance issues.

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

The data components that showed the greatest decline were ELA Learning Gains, Math Learning Gains, and Social Studies learning gains. All three of these components declined 9% from the previous school year. Some factors that contributed to these non-proficient scores were continuing substitutes in several classrooms and attendance issues.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Social Studies achievement. Fort McCoy School was 29% lower than the state average. A factor that contributed to this decline is a continuous substitute in an advanced Civics course.

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

Fort McCoy School did not have a data component that improved from the previous school year. There was a decline in each component.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Based on data from the EWS data, two potential concerns for Fort McCoy School are 1. the number of students who have two or more early warning indicators and 2. the number of students who attend school less than 90 percent of the school year.

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

1. Increase student proficiency and learning gains in ELA.
2. Increase student proficiency and learning gains in Math.
3. Increase student proficiency and learning gains in Science.
4. Increase student proficiency and learning gains in Social Studies.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the state data from the Florida Standards Assessments, Fort McCoy School showed a decline in all areas except science achievement and acceleration. This data indicates that we need to focus on purposeful tier 1 instructional and differentiation strategies that target students weakest areas in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies then proficiency rates and learning gains will improve overall.

**Measurable Outcome:** If teachers provide intentional, meaningful and purposeful tier 1 instructional and differentiation strategies, then student proficiency (including students with a federal index below 41%) will increase by 3% or more in both ELA, Math, Science and Civics as measured by FSA, FSSA and EOC.

Grade ELA Math Science Civics

3rd 58% 61% 47% 50%

4th 34% 37% 35% 38%

5th 33% 36% 24% 27% 38% 41%

6th 38% 41% 35% 38%

7th 36% 39% 43% 46% 51% 54%

8th 47% 50% 30% 33% 47% 50%

SWD 7% to 10% 12% to 15% 17% to 20% 29% to 32%

ED 34% to 37% 32% to 35% 38% to 41% 45% to 48%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The Administrative team, Principal, Assistant Principals, and Content- Area Specialist will observe tier 1 instruction that occurs in the classroom. The team will provide feedback in a timely manner to improve any concerns in instruction. Third grade-fifth grade teachers will meet with the administrative team for weekly collaborative meetings to plan for standards, evaluate learner performance and problem solve. Middle School teachers will meet with the administrative team to review instruction and data scheduled on an on-going basis. Teachers will use data from iReady, weekly lessons, and standards mastery assessments to guide their instruction. The leadership team will analyze student data to determine teacher and learner needs as well as provide instructional support and resources as needed. Teachers will be provided professional development in research based instructional strategies to assist in creating engaging learning opportunities in the classroom.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research suggests that when teacher collaboration is properly implemented, there are benefits for both teachers and students. "Student achievement gains are greater in schools with stronger collaborative environments and in classrooms of teachers who are stronger collaborators". (Learning Forward)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Frequent classroom observations and feedback provided.

**Person Responsible** Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Collaborative Meetings with administration. (weekly for Elementary)

**Person Responsible** Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Research based professional development opportunities.

**Person**  
**Responsible** Dossella Elder (dossella.elder@marion.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Other specifically relating to On-going Professional Development**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Teachers need professional development because it provides ongoing opportunities for educators to improve their knowledge and skills so they can help students achieve. When our educators learn, our students learn more.

If FMS provides teachers with effective professional development in the following area: AVID, CKLA, and standards aligned formative assessments, then students will increase learning gains by 3% or more as measured by FSA.

**Measurable Outcome:** Grade ELA Math  
 3/4th 34% 37% 37% 40%  
 5th 43% 46% 37% 40%  
 6th 39% 42% 44% 47%  
 7th 30% 33% 52% 55%  
 8th 53% 56% 45% 48%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The Administrative team, Principal, Assistant Principals, Content- Area Specialist and District specialists will observe tier 1 instruction that occurs in the classroom and make professional development decisions based on data gathered. Teachers will be provided professional development in research based instructional strategies to assist in creating engaging learning opportunities in the classroom.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** When educators engage in professional development at their schools with their peers, they learn from one another, support one another, and assist in holding each other accountable for applying what they learned. Offering professional development during the school year makes it easier for educators to apply what they learn immediately which allows students to benefit immediately. (Learning Forward)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Frequent classroom observations to obtain data on what professional development needs are necessary.

**Person Responsible:** Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Deliver research based instructional strategies once a month on early release days.

**Person Responsible:** Dossella Elder (dossella.elder@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Content Area Specialist will provide on-going support to struggling teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Leona Hunt (leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. District Specialists will provide on-going support to struggling teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Other specifically relating to Family Engagement**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Based on the state data from the Florida Standards Assessments, Fort McCoy School showed a decline in all areas except science achievement and acceleration. This information shows a need for improvement and focusing on improving family engagement is way to increase student achievement.
	If we provide capacity building strategies to parents and families that address and promote positive home environments, then the at home environment will foster continued learning linked to core subjects and social emotional learning (SEL) strategies as measured by FSA and FSSA. *up to 3% proficiency increase
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Grade ELA Math 3rd 58% 61% 47% 50% 4th 34% 37% 35% 38% 5th 33% 36% 24% 27% 6th 38% 41% 35% 38% 7th 36% 39% 43% 46% 8th 47% 50% 30% 33%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Fort McCoy School will provide clear communication of school-wide policies and procedures, educational focus, and information about family engagement opportunities to families through the school website, Skylert messages, school marquees and monthly newsletters.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Research from the University of Chicago states that strong family and community involvement is significantly and positively related to student achievement. One study found a significant relationship between school family partnership programs emphasizing teacher and parent collaboration and frequent communication between teachers and parents and academic achievement of students. A different study found that in schools with higher levels of trust between teachers and families, student achievement in math and reading was higher.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Keep school website updated.

**Person Responsible** Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Send frequent Skylert messages to families.

**Person Responsible** Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Utilize the school marquee to advertise events.

**Person Responsible** Dossella Elder (dossella.elder@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. Send home a monthly newsletter.

**Person Responsible** Dossella Elder (dossella.elder@marion.k12.fl.us)

5. Refer to school-based Parent and Family Engagement Plan

**Person Responsible** Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**The School Leadership Team will continuously monitor the school wide improvement priorities through classroom walk-throughs, professional learning opportunities, providing timely feedback to teachers, and continuously working to improve student achievement.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
- Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: On-going Professional Development	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Family Engagement	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>