

Marion County Public Schools

McIntosh Area School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	14
Budget to Support Goals	15

McIntosh Area School

20400 10TH ST, McIntosh, FL 32664

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: David Friedlander

Start Date for this Principal: 10/28/2019

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)	92%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: A (66%) 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	15

McIntosh Area School

20400 10TH ST, McIntosh, FL 32664

[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>100%</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>22%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

McIntosh Area Charter School is committed to providing a challenging, high quality, first class, education for our students. We strive to fulfill the needs of the whole child by delivering creative lessons designed to inspire dreamers and doers. Our goal is to ensure all students put their knowledge into practical practices, foster a thirst for knowledge, and instill lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

McIntosh Area Charter School's vision is to provide a safe learning environment where students feel comfortable taking academic risks.

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
Roach, Jennifer	Principal	Lead the school for continuous improvement
Mason, Tamara	Teacher, K-12	Support principal in the goal of improvement

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/28/2019, David Friedlander

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

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)	92%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: A (66%) 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	6	14	10	8	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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

Friday 8/14/2020

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	13	11	10	10	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Attendance below 90 percent	7	3	3	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	4	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	2	1	0	0	1	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

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	13	11	10	10	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Attendance below 90 percent	7	3	3	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	4	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	2	1	0	0	1	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

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%	47%	57%	62%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	56%	58%	55%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	53%	0%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	41%	51%	63%	59%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	58%	62%	73%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	51%	0%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	47%	53%	79%	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	27%	44%	-17%	58%	-31%
	2018	29%	46%	-17%	57%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	49%	-49%	58%	-58%
	2018	23%	43%	-20%	56%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
	2018	53%	46%	7%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	49%	1%	62%	-12%
	2018	29%	48%	-19%	62%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	54%	-54%	64%	-64%
	2018	8%	47%	-39%	62%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2019	46%	45%	1%	60%	-14%
	2018	67%	50%	17%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	36%	44%	-8%	53%	-17%
	2018	67%	49%	18%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-31%				
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
WHT	42	72		48	63		27				
FRL	33	73		33	57						
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
WHT	36	35		36	24						
FRL	33	40		33	30						
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
WHT	64	59		64	71		83				
FRL	58	43		50	71						

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	244
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	50
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	49
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.

Although we did not have FSA data for the 19-20 school year, students continued to show evidence of low performance in the areas of both reading and math. One factor that has impacted student performance is students completing online learning as opposed to face to face instruction. The interventions that teachers could provide in the classroom were limited with online instruction especially when students were absent from instruction.

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

Although we did not have FSA data for the 19-20 school year, students continued to show evidence of low performance in the areas of both reading and math.

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.

We did not have data for the 19-20 school year that would allow us to measure this.

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

We did not have data for the 19-20 school year that would allow us to measure this.

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

Student achievement in the areas of reading and math are areas of concern.

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

1. Student achievement in reading
2. Student achievement in math
3. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Standards-aligned instruction is critical to ensure that the students are receiving the instruction they need in order to be successful academically. Standards-aligned instruction will allow for better monitoring of ongoing student performance, as student data will be available that is directly correlated to the instruction/learning that is taking place.

Measurable Outcome: Student data will show an increase of at least 30% on the second iReady diagnostic assessment in the areas of reading and math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Roach (jennifer.roach@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will participate in ongoing curriculum/standards training. Teachers will then provide instruction that is directly aligned to the curriculum and this will be evidenced in their lesson plans as well as through walkthroughs/classroom visits.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected because it will ensure that teachers are skilled in correlating the standards to the curriculum/instruction, providing students the highest opportunity for success.

Action Steps to Implement

Training on standards will be provided during pre-planning and throughout the year.

Person Responsible Jennifer Roach (jennifer.roach@marion.k12.fl.us)

PD will be provided on various curriculum that will be used, as well as ways to use the data that the curriculum provides.

Person Responsible Jennifer Roach (jennifer.roach@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monthly data meetings will take place to review data and to make data informed decisions about future instructional needs.

Person Responsible Jennifer Roach (jennifer.roach@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.

Data will be monitored from iReady, Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessments, and Foundational Skills Checks after each assessment. Teachers and school leadership will meet to discuss the results and identify opportunities for this data to drive instructional decisions. Immediate changes will be made as indicated to ensure that students are receiving the instruction they need to be successful.

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.

Communication through monthly newsletters will be delivered to parents, staff, and stakeholders through social media. Additionally, our website has been revised to better share information about our school with stakeholders. Board meetings are also a source of two-way communication for stakeholders. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, events for stakeholder participation will be limited but will include online opportunities through Google Meets and Facebook.

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
Total:			\$0.00