

Marion County Public Schools

North Marion Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

North Marion Middle School

2085 W HIGHWAY 329, Citra, FL 32113

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: James Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

North Marion Middle School

2085 W HIGHWAY 329, Citra, FL 32113

[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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	75%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

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.

North Marion Middle School will provide a quality academic program that prepares students to become responsible and successful in our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Striving for academic excellence in student performance through empowering students to take ownership of their learning.

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
Jones, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist will serve as support for our teachers in curriculum mapping and instructional strategies. MDT member.
Ellers, David	Principal	The role and responsibility of the principal is to analyze and monitor progress of students and staff as it relates to daily activities.
Gamoneda, Sheila	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Curriculum works with teachers, students, and parents to promote instructional strategies that will meet the needs of all students. MDT member.
Tucker, Tamara	Dean	The dean will serve as support for our teachers in intervention and behavior strategies. MDT team member.
Norton, Keven	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal for Discipline works with teachers, students and parents to promote instructional strategies, and elicit behavioral support that will meet the needs of all students. Lead facilitator for MTSS process and MTD.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, James Johnson

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.*

4

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.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (41%)
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 .	

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	269	287	269	0	0	0	0	825
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	97	98	0	0	0	0	253
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	84	0	0	0	0	170
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	70	72	0	0	0	0	145
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	70	71	0	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	83	62	0	0	0	0	218
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	91	68	0	0	0	0	244

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	30	26	28	0	0	0	0	84

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/10/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	258	267	270	0	0	0	0	795
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	42	33	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	41	33	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	21	20	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	89	59	0	0	0	0	212

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	133	130	181	0	0	0	0	444	

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	258	267	270	0	0	0	0	795	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	42	33	0	0	0	0	98	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	41	33	0	0	0	0	111	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	21	20	0	0	0	0	50	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	89	59	0	0	0	0	212	

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	133	130	181	0	0	0	0	444	

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	

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	43%	49%	54%	38%	45%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	54%	54%	46%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	46%	47%	39%	36%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	49%	54%	58%	34%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	56%	58%	57%	45%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	50%	51%	39%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	34%	46%	51%	35%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	70%	72%	67%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	39%	45%	-6%	54%	-15%
	2018	40%	44%	-4%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	40%	46%	-6%	52%	-12%
	2018	38%	43%	-5%	51%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
	2018	42%	49%	-7%	58%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	44%	46%	-2%	55%	-11%
	2018	31%	42%	-11%	52%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	35%	49%	-14%	54%	-19%
	2018	37%	49%	-12%	54%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	54%	41%	13%	46%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	39%	43%	-4%	45%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	35%	44%	-9%	48%	-13%
	2018	33%	46%	-13%	50%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	62%	65%	-3%	71%	-9%
2018	61%	64%	-3%	71%	-10%
Compare		1%			
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	96%	54%	42%	61%	35%
2018	93%	57%	36%	62%	31%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	51%	49%	57%	43%
2018	100%	54%	46%	56%	44%
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	10	32	26	19	45	30	9	27			
ELL	12	47	64	29	48	43		61			
BLK	24	43	38	29	51	41	18	49	38		
HSP	38	55	50	50	57	54	30	69	70		
MUL	61	54		72	68		55	70			
WHT	57	55	46	61	57	42	46	74	68		
FRL	40	50	40	46	54	43	30	64	63		
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	10	35	35	10	36	32	10	30			
ELL	15	40	55	10	41	47	13	31			
BLK	26	47	43	27	48	37	20	46	82		
HSP	46	52	50	44	59	50	43	57	79		
MUL	51	44		51	63		25	85			
WHT	46	55	47	48	56	40	36	68	72		
FRL	37	49	44	38	53	40	32	56	73		
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	7	39	39	5	33	31	10	34			
ELL	13	35	42	10	31	39	13	52			
BLK	22	37	37	20	41	41	17	49	40		
HSP	42	50	38	32	39	32	33	76	55		
MUL	43	54		39	57		30	62			
WHT	49	51	42	46	51	40	57	75	61		
FRL	33	45	38	29	45	40	30	63	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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
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	451

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	56
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Data from the 8th grade FCAT science assessment reveals that we have declined by 10% in the past three years. In 2015/2016 43% of our students were proficient. In 2016/2017, we fell to 35% and then again in 2017-2018 we dropped to 33% proficiency. In 2018-2019 we increased our proficiency to 35%; however, with this declining trend of low proficiency, this again is our direct area of focus for the 2019-2020 school year. Factors that contributed to the previous years' decline are representative of standards from 6th and 7th grade not infused into the 8th grade curriculum.

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

Data reveals that our 7th grade math had the greatest decline from the 2018-2019 school year. We dropped from 37% to 35% proficiency. We are 14% below the district average, and are aware that our students have come to us with a lack of basic knowledge in math in 6th grade. The trends that factor into this decline are lacking knowledge of time tables, and factoring. As a result, we are working on intervention strategies to support our students in all areas of math, with a focus on the two mentioned above.

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.

Data reveals that our 7th grade math had the greatest gap which was 19% below the state average. On average we have seen a decline in basic math skills. With that said, in all 5 of the reporting categories we were deficient. However, we received 50% of the possible points earned in Number Systems (6/12) and Ratio and Proportions (4/8).

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

Data reveals that our 8th grade math students excelled this year. In comparison to the previous year, we increased by 15%. In comparison with the state average, we were 9% higher. This year we incorporated more hands-on, and inquiry based activities. Bringing in real-world activities provided the much needed incentive for learning and mastery.

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

For the 2019-2020 school year, we will focus on decreasing our Level 1 students by 10%, which would account for approximately 21 students in grades 6-8.

Also, we will focus our resources on decreasing our suspension rate, by using our MDT team, by an overall 10%. This is approximately eleven students, but realizing that these are also students who scored a level 1 on FSA.

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

1. 7th grade Math
2. 6th grade Reading
3. 8th grade Science
4. Students With Disabilities- All categories
5. African American Students- All categories

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Math 6-8

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Based on data from previous years, math has shown a decline overall. Basic foundational skills that are necessary for higher levels of math in secondary education are lacking in 6th grade, and for this reason we are implementing iReady online as an intervention.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

If NMMS math teachers consistently plan and deliver lessons with learning targets aligned to the Florida Standards in mathematics, utilize Math 180 with fidelity, monitor students' progress, and have data chats with the students based on student data, then student understanding and proficiency will increase as measured by FSA scores.

Grade 6 - baseline 44% with target of 55%

Grade 7 - baseline 35% with target of 54%

Grade 8 - baseline 54% with target of 75%

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Keven Norton (keven.norton@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Math 180 instruction is the evidence-based strategy that will be used as supplemental remediation for select lowest 25%. Develop and use high quality Standards Boards in all mathematics classrooms.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

The district provides the diagnostic assessment three times a year for us to track growth. While using the online version during the 2018-2019 school year, we had significant improvement in our 6th grade FSA math proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development will be provided through Curriculum Associates.

**Person
Responsible**

David Eilers (david.eilers@marion.k12.fl.us)

Each math teacher will be provided a chromebook cart for use with instruction as available.

**Person
Responsible**

Sheila Gamoneda (sheila.gamoneda@marion.k12.fl.us)

All students will complete a diagnostic assessment to target areas in need of improvement.

**Person
Responsible**

Sheila Gamoneda (sheila.gamoneda@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students will then complete Math 180 for remediation.

**Person
Responsible**

Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will use iReady data to provide small group support as needed by individual students.

**Person
Responsible**

Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

Train teachers on Common Boards with focus on high quality learning targets and checks for understanding.

Person Responsible David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)

Implement Math 180 with select remedial students.

Person Responsible Sheila Gamoneda (sheila.gamoneda@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading 6-8 For the 20-21 school year, data revealed that reading proficiency dropped. In reporting categories, it reveals that in the area of integration of knowledge and ideas, and key ideas and details students were less than 50% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	If ALL NMMS teachers consistently deliver the Florida Standards aligned instruction in reading/content, monitor students' progress through iReady diagnostic, integrate reading and writing across the curriculum, QSMAs, and writing; and have data chats with their students, then student understanding and proficiency will increase in the area of "Integration of Knowledge and Ideas" as measured by FSA data. 6th grade - 39% - with target of 54% 7th grade - 40% - with target of 52% 8th grade - 48% - with target of 56%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Higher order questioning and discussion strategies will be implemented in all subject areas. Reading and writing will be integrated across all curriculum areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of Higher Order Questioning will increase rigor to assist students in moving through Costa's Three Levels of Thinking to Increase Inquiry; which requires integration of knowledge and ideas.
Action Steps to Implement	
District Professional Development	
Person Responsible	David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)
Monthly school-based professional development	
Person Responsible	Sheila Gamoneda (sheila.gamoneda@marion.k12.fl.us)
Weekly collaboration planning by subject, and grade level	
Person Responsible	Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)
Instructional Coaching	
Person Responsible	Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)
Review of lesson plans and use of learning walks	
Person Responsible	Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)
Implement Common Boards with high quality learning targets and checks for understanding.	

Person Responsible	David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	--

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

8th Grade Science

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Previous data on FCAT science indicates that there has been a steady decline in proficiency on the 8th grade FCAT science assessment. In 2018, it dropped to 33% proficiency. With the state average at 48%, we need to improve our proficiency.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

If NMMS science teachers consistently review and engage students in the FCAT science standards for 8th grade by infusing the 6th and 7th grade standards and teachers consistently plan and deliver lessons with learning targets aligned to the Florida Standards in mathematics we will see growth from 35% to 48% on the 8th grade FCAT science assessment.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Sheila Gamoneda (sheila.gamoneda@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

As a department, along with our Content Area Specialist and Administration, and District support, the current curriculum will followed and revised to align the 6th and 7th grade standards within the 8th grade curriculum. A deeper understanding of these standards will be reviewed throughout the school year in 8th grade science. Implement high quality standards boards in all science classrooms.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

By utilizing various resources, teachers will be better able to infuse the standards that are usually not taught within the 8th grade physical science curriculum. District program specialist will assist teachers with evidence based strategies that may be found in other schools for student success. Content area specialist will work with teachers on reading strategies for science comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

Convene all science teachers

**Person
Responsible**

Sheila Gamoneda (sheila.gamoneda@marion.k12.fl.us)

Break down standards with test item specifications

**Person
Responsible**

Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

Work together during subject area and grade level collaboration - 2x per month

**Person
Responsible**

Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evaluate success on QSMA for Earth Space, Life, and Physical Science to determine any review needed

**Person
Responsible**

David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)

Look at data from CSMA to determine review for overall success

**Person
Responsible**

David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)

Implement Common Boards with high quality learning targets and checks for understanding.

Person Responsible David Ellers (david.ellers@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.

Federal Index Subgroups: ELL, SWD, and African American students are included in this priority. For ELL students, ESOL paraprofessionals will work one-on-one with students in deficient areas. Our students with disabilities will also have one on one time with paraprofessionals and Inclusion teachers. In all classes, our African American students will receive support from teachers and paraprofessionals in their areas of weakness.

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: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00