

Marion County Public Schools

Marion Charter 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Marion Charter School

39 CEDAR RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Axson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Marion Charter School

39 CEDAR RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>94%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>64%</p>

School Grades History

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

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Axson, Michelle	Principal	Mrs. Axson oversees the daily operation of the school from personnel and students, as well as the budget.
Wells, Valerie	School Counselor	
Hinerman, Alison	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Michelle Axson

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.*

14

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

14

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	31	30	38	34	34	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/4/2020

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	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

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	32	32	37	36	42	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	212
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	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	

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	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	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	
	(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	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%

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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	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	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	68
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	58
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.

Since we do not have State data for the 19-20 school year, we are continuing to work on our previous year's goals. 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 5th grade teacher resign at Thanksgiving, and had a long term sub the remainder of the year.

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

The drop in our 5th grade Science scores last year could contribute to teacher preparedness as well as having one of our 5th grade teachers resigned at Thanksgiving break, and we had to hire a long term sub for the remainder of the year.

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 in previous year's.

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. Will continue this practice for the 2020-21 school year.

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus	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.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers implement effective standards based instruction in Science and Math, then student learning gains and proficiencies will increase by at least 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was implemented last year in reading, which contributed to our continued growth. We will know implement this in all academic areas.
Action Steps to Implement	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide continued professional development to our teachers and aides. 2. Schedule collaborative planning times for grade levels in order to develop strong lessons and activities.
Person Responsible	Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 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.

Measurable Outcome: If we focus parent and family engagement activities on ELA, Math, and measureable Science standards and build a strong foundation for two-way communication outcome the school plans to achieve Person responsible with families, then student learning gains will increase based on local assessments and diagnostic data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide hands on meetings for parents and students for Math Night, Reading Night, and Science Night.
2. Provide parents with many forms of communication such as our webiste, DOJO, Facebook, etc.

Person Responsible Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@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.

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: 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.

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.

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: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00