

Marion County Public Schools

Dr N H Jones Elementary 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

Dr N H Jones Elementary School

1900 SW 5TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Hensel

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2020

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)	68%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (83%) 2017-18: A (81%) 2016-17: A (86%) 2015-16: A (85%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Dr N H Jones Elementary School

1900 SW 5TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[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	48%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

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.

In an innovative environment, students will excel in basic academics with enhanced learning in STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Mathematics).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dr. N. H. Jones Elementary, where every child will achieve academic excellence.

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
Houle, Jennifer	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -monitor data -coach teachers on instructional practices -lead grade level discussions -determine school wide needs based on data -determine professional development needs of the school
Coleman, Lisa	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -monitor data -coach teachers on instructional practices -lead grade level discussions -assist with MTSS
Abbruzzi, Julie	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -assist with socio-emotional needs of students -assist with MTSS -assist with IEP/EP compliance
Hall, Carol	Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -monitor student behavior -provide assistance to teachers with classroom management plans and interventions

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/14/2020, Robert Hensel

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.*

3

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

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)	68%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (83%) 2017-18: A (81%) 2016-17: A (86%) 2015-16: A (85%)
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	127	140	139	123	103	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	731
Attendance below 90 percent	0	42	38	33	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	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	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	4	0	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

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	142	117	108	103	108	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	142	117	108	103	108	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	91%	47%	57%	96%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	78%	56%	58%	81%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	77%	52%	53%	81%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	93%	51%	63%	97%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	58%	62%	78%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	49%	51%	74%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	90%	47%	53%	98%	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	91%	44%	47%	58%	33%
	2018	93%	46%	47%	57%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	94%	49%	45%	58%	36%
	2018	92%	43%	49%	56%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	90%	45%	45%	56%	34%
	2018	92%	46%	46%	55%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	95%	49%	46%	62%	33%
	2018	94%	48%	46%	62%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	54%	35%	64%	25%
	2018	90%	47%	43%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	95%	45%	50%	60%	35%
	2018	98%	50%	48%	61%	37%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	90%	44%	46%	53%	37%
	2018	89%	49%	40%	55%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	70										
ASN	100	78		100	91		100				
BLK	74	71	62	78	66	55	70				
HSP	95	93		100	93						
MUL	83			75							
WHT	96	79	83	96	82	73	94				
FRL	80	78	54	79	72	61	74				
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	90		100	85		100				
BLK	73	53	58	76	53	67	53				
HSP	100	80		100	90						
WHT	95	76	73	97	73	80	93				
FRL	80	60	60	84	59	72	72				
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
ASN	100	86		100	77		100				
BLK	85	76	78	93	73	67	94				
HSP	94	86		94	86						
WHT	98	82	80	98	79	73	98				
FRL	88	73	69	90	70	60	100				

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	83
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	581
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	70
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	94
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	68
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
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
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	86
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	71
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.

Our lowest performance area was learning gains for the bottom quartile in math. Limited differentiation to target the needs of the math students in the bottom quartile may have contributed to this being the lowest area of performance

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was learning gains for the bottom quartile in math. Limited differentiation to target the needs of the math students in the bottom quartile may have contributed to this being the lowest area of performance.

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 are above the state average in all areas. The subject with the largest gap is Science. We are above the state average by 37%.

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

We increased by 11% in the math learning gains category. We had data driven conversations regarding students scores and what was required to receive a learning gain. This is was accomplished through bi-weekly collaboration meetings.

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

N/A

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

1. Differentiation and support for students in the bottom quartile.
2. Differentiation and support for students to make a learning gain.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We would like to increase learning gains in the identified bottom quartile identified students in math. We lost ground in the gains from our bottom quartile.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide targeted and specific differentiated instruction, then we will increase our Math bottom quartile by 10 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers will collaborate weekly with administration and their peers to create standards based lessons and plan small group differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will look at data and collaborate together and plan based on student need weekly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly Collaborative planning meetings with each grade level.
2. PMP meetings to discuss student progress and interventions (3x year).
3. Support in collaborative planning sessions from district as needed.

Person Responsible Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We would like to increase learning gains in ELA. We went up 4% in learning gains for reading, however we want to continue to make learning gains for all learners.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide targeted and specific differentiated instruction, then we will increase our ELA learning gains by 10 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Houle (jennifer.houle@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers will collaborate weekly with administration and their peers to create standards based lessons and plan small group differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will look at data and collaborate together and plan based on student need weekly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly Collaborative planning meetings with each grade level.
2. PMP meetings to discuss student progress and interventions (3x year).
3. Support in collaborative planning sessions from district as needed.

Person Responsible Lisa Coleman (lisa.coleman@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.

Professional Development**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 are not a Title I school, but are a magnet school and have outstanding parent involvement. Each year we offer opportunities for our parents to participate in Open Houses, conferences, and school events. Parents will continue to be kept informed of their child's progress through Family Access, Parent-Teacher conferences (face to face or phone), progress reports, and report cards. Teachers also provide parents with

daily notes concerning behavior or an academic notification. We have SAC committee that meets regularly and is compromised of various stakeholders.

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
Total:			\$0.00