

Marion County Public Schools

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts

401 NW MARTIN LUTHER KING JR AVE, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: John Kerley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 62% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (87%) 2017-18: A (84%) 2016-17: A (88%) 2015-16: A (87%) |
| 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

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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts

401 NW MARTIN LUTHER KING JR AVE, Ocala, FL 34475

[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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School KG-5 | No | 50% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 45% |

School Grades History

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

The faculty, staff, parents, and business partners of Madison Street Academy of Visual and Performing Arts work together to provide a quality learning environment that ensures success through the integration of the arts, academics, and technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Madison Street Academy is committed to providing a quality learning environment that ensures success through the integration of the arts, academics, and technology.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Kerley, John | Principal | Provide 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. |
| Parks, Megan | Assistant Principal | To aid 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. |
| Stoddard, Angela | School Counselor | Ability to read, interpret, and follow State Board rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and appropriate state and federal statutes. 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. |
| | Dean | Ability to read, interpret, and follow State Board rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and appropriate state and federal statutes. Knowledge and understanding of child development and the unique needs and characteristics of students served. Knowledge and understanding of student management programs, and services. Ability to counsel and assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in behavior and mental health. Ability to verbally communicate and consult with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to maintain sensitivity to multicultural issues. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/9/2019, John Kerley

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

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) | 62% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (87%) 2017-18: A (84%) 2016-17: A (88%) 2015-16: A (87%) |
| 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 | 69 | 71 | 72 | 75 | 75 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 446 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| One or more suspensions | 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 | |
| Course failure in Math | 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 8/31/2020

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 | 70 | 72 | 68 | 72 | 80 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 449 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 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 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 70 | 72 | 68 | 72 | 80 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 449 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 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 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 94% | 47% | 57% | 99% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 83% | 56% | 58% | 82% | 57% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 88% | 52% | 53% | 88% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 91% | 51% | 63% | 98% | 52% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 85% | 58% | 62% | 76% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 78% | 49% | 51% | 80% | 43% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 93% | 47% | 53% | 95% | 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 | 93% | 44% | 49% | 58% | 35% |
| | 2018 | 90% | 46% | 44% | 57% | 33% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 92% | 49% | 43% | 58% | 34% |
| | 2018 | 92% | 43% | 49% | 56% | 36% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 96% | 45% | 51% | 56% | 40% |
| | 2018 | 94% | 46% | 48% | 55% | 39% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 87% | 49% | 38% | 62% | 25% |
| | 2018 | 94% | 48% | 46% | 62% | 32% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 93% | 54% | 39% | 64% | 29% |
| | 2018 | 97% | 47% | 50% | 62% | 35% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 93% | 45% | 48% | 60% | 33% |
| | 2018 | 98% | 50% | 48% | 61% | 37% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 93% | 44% | 49% | 53% | 40% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 98% | 49% | 49% | 55% | 43% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 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 | 77 | | | 85 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 91 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 84 | 83 | 88 | 76 | 71 | 70 | 78 | | | | |
| HSP | 100 | 94 | | 96 | 89 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 100 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 96 | 81 | 89 | 94 | 88 | 87 | 96 | | | | |
| FRL | 87 | 83 | 79 | 87 | 81 | 75 | 81 | | | | |
| 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 |
| ASN | 100 | 80 | | 100 | 100 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 81 | 65 | 67 | 86 | 65 | 64 | | | | | |
| HSP | 97 | 95 | | 100 | 74 | | 100 | | | | |
| MUL | 92 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 94 | 71 | 70 | 98 | 81 | 79 | 100 | | | | |
| FRL | 85 | 67 | 65 | 94 | 74 | 68 | 93 | | | | |
| 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 | 100 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 80 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 91 | 81 | 73 | 91 | 57 | | 92 | | | | |
| HSP | 100 | 79 | | 96 | 92 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 100 | 82 | | 100 | 91 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 100 | 81 | 89 | 99 | 73 | 84 | 95 | | | | |
| FRL | 95 | 79 | 79 | 97 | 69 | 73 | 95 | | | | |

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 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 87 |
| 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 | 612 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 81 |
| 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 | 96 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 79 |
| 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 | 95 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 100 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 90 |
| 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 | 82 |
| 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.

The component from the 2019 FSA that showed the lowest performance was Math learning gains of the lowest 25% (78%). However, this group showed an increase of 1% over the previous year. Thus the trend is upward and a focus on this group will look to yield continued increases in this area.

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

Based on 2019 FSA, overall learning gains in math showed the largest decline of any area (6%). However, Madison Street is still at 91% proficiency in this area. The decline was due to the performance of the 5th grade. Several students contributed to this decline. An overall focus in this area in 5th grade will yield more favorable results this school 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.

Based on 2019 FSA Data, the component that has the largest gap when compared to the state average was that of 5th Grade ELA proficiency. Madison Street had 96% of its 5th grade student's at the proficient level. The state average was 56%. Effective tier I instruction is the result of this positive gap.

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

The component that showed the most improvement from the 2018 FSA was ELA learning gains of the lowest 25%. A focus on differentiated instruction was the main factor for this improvement.

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

Given that we did not have any students identified by the EWS, we do not see a potential area of concern. However, we will always focus on the attendance of our students.

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

1. 1. Learning Gains in Math of 4th & 5th Grade
2. Learning Gains in ELA of 4th & 5th Grade
3. Proficiency level of 5th Grade

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on our 2019 FSA scores, If teachers incorporate rigor, and therefore differentiate their instruction at a higher level, including teaching strategies and learning activities, then students will show learning gains. |
| Measurable Outcome: | A 2% increase of learning gains in Math and ELA as measured by the 19-20 FSA, as well as 2% increase in Science proficiency. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | John Kerley (john.kerley@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Research has shown (Understanding Rigor in the Classroom) that and increased level of instructional rigor will result in a positive outcome in student learning results. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | A substantial increase in overall achievement level occurred in 18 FSA results in both Math and ELA. Given this increase, a focus on learning gains will be necessary to continue this positive trend. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Differentiated instruction (including center instruction)
2. Goal #1: 2% increase in learning gains in 4th & 5th Grade
3. Goal #2: 2% increase in learning gains in 4th & 5th Grade
4. Goal #3: 2% increase in proficiency in 5th Grade

Person Responsible John Kerley (john.kerley@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.

These areas of focus were determined after a disaggregation of the most recent FSA data (2019). These goals will be adapted after the most recent local assessment data is available and then a twenty day plan can be devised. Of the following priorities, Learning Gains of 4th & 5th Grade in Math, Learning Gains of 4th & 5th grade in ELA, and Science proficiency rates will be our remaining school wide improvement priorities. Incorporating a higher level of rigor into classroom instruction. If teachers incorporate a higher level of rigor into academic instruction, including teaching strategies and learning activities, then students will show learning gains and overall academic improvement.

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.

Our School-wide plan to address and build a positive school culture and environment is titled Maslow over Bloom. This theme was developed over the Spring shutdown of schools and the planning for re-opening and planning for the 20-21 school year. It was developed with a team of administrators, teachers, support staff, parents and other school stakeholders. The purpose was to ensure that our faculty and staff's most basic needs (Maslow) were taken care of, so that they were then prepared to begin to ensure that the needs of those that they serve (Students & Parents), could be addressed. Only then, would we as a school be prepared to provide the academic needs (Bloom) of our students.

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: Differentiation | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |