

Marion County Public Schools

New Leaf Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

New Leaf Center

1601 NE 25TH AVE STE 602, Ocala, FL 34470

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Katherine Austin

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

New Leaf Center

1601 NE 25TH AVE STE 602, Ocala, FL 34470

[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)
Combination School KG-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

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 mission of New Leaf Center is to promote the increase of life-long learners by providing a positive educational environment that empowers the at-risk youth of Marion County to be responsible and productive citizens while being supported by a community that recognizes student potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

New Leaf Center is a caring place where students and staff feel they make a contribution and are valued as individuals within a positive school culture that supports collaboration, respect, and trust. New Leaf Center strives to empower students to reach their highest academic potential and encourages social and emotional growth through character development, positive relationships, and a diverse cultural awareness.

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
Vernon, Katherine	Principal	Oversees all operations: managerial as well as instructional. She collaborates with all faculty for planning and improvement purposes, provides focused and ongoing feedback, communicated decisions, performs formal and informal observations which include pre and post conferences, completes evaluations for all faculty members, supervises the execution of professional development plans, and leads the school in fostering a positive environment with a shared vision.
Malpica, Cassandra	Assistant Principal	Ms. Malpica ensures the daily operations and discipline procedures are supportive of student learning and instructional goals. Ms. Malpica works closely with the instructional coach to support teachers in lesson planning, professional development, data analysis, decision making, and providing academic interventions.
Grandstaff, Marci	Other	Ms. Grandstaff contributes to the academic success of students by providing social skill development through weekly small group sessions. She develops behavior plans to identify appropriate interventions and accommodations to ensure that each student is able to equitably access the curriculum. Ms. Grandstaff works directly with teachers and behavior staff to identify trends in student behaviors to better support student and staff in the academic process.
Palmer, Tess	Instructional Coach	Ms. Palmer facilitates various professional development opportunities, oversees all curriculum and instruction and works closely with teachers in their classrooms to ensure that instructional guidelines and individual student needs are being met. Ms. Palmer coordinates assessments for all students. Ms. Palmer assists in allocating curriculum resources, selecting programs for student learning, leading teachers in instructional practices, monitoring assessment data/student progress for mastery of standards, contributing to informal observations and classroom walk-throughs, and providing data for administrative decision making. In addition, Ms. Palmer will serve as an intervention teacher, working with our lowest quartile. She will focus on skill specific deficiencies in a small group setting.
Evans, Keith	Administrative Support	Mr. Evans plays an essential role in the instructional process as the Student Support Specialist. As students transitions to and from NLC, Mr. Evans ensures that students are enrolled in the correct courses, facilitates credit recovery as needed, and continuously examines transcripts to ensure that students are earning units and credits, as well as all graduation requirements. In addition, Mr. Evans oversees the behavior team as they work to identify behavioral needs that are essential to the learning process and ensures the school wide behavior modification program is implemented with fidelity to support student learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/30/2015, Katherine Austin

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.*

0

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

15

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	2	7	6	4	4	17	6	6	8	4	64
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	2	5	5	3	3	13	5	2	6	2	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	5	4	0	3	8	2	2	3	1	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	3	12	0	3	6	2	33
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	1	2	9	3	3	6	3	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	2	3	2	2	21

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	2	7	6	4	4	17	6	6	8	4	64

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	1	2	0	1	1	12	2	4	3	3	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/17/2020

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	5	5	8	11	7	11	8	10	16	13	94
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	4	5	3	6	4	6	4	8	8	3	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	4	6	8	6	6	7	6	7	7	60
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	5	9	3	8	9	2	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	4	4	4	6	6	7	37

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	4	4	7	8	7	10	7	8	15	9	79

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	3	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	1	18

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	5	5	8	11	7	11	8	10	16	13	94
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	4	5	3	6	4	6	4	8	8	3	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	4	6	8	6	6	7	6	7	7	60
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	5	9	3	8	9	2	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	4	4	4	6	6	7	37

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	4	4	7	8	7	10	7	8	15	9	79

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	3	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	1	18

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	0%	42%	61%	0%	43%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	45%	59%	0%	49%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	36%	54%	0%	42%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	0%	41%	62%	0%	40%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	51%	59%	0%	54%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	52%	0%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	40%	56%	0%	39%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	53%	78%	0%	54%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey															
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	0%	44%	-44%	58%	-58%
	2018	17%	46%	-29%	57%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	21%	49%	-28%	58%	-37%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	22%	45%	-23%	56%	-34%
	2018	13%	46%	-33%	55%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
06	2019	0%	45%	-45%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
07	2019	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	50%	-50%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	53%	-53%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	46%	-46%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	49%	-49%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	54%	-54%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	20%	45%	-25%	60%	-40%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
06	2019	0%	46%	-46%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	41%	-41%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	11%	44%	-33%	53%	-42%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	44%	-44%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	65%	-65%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	64%	-64%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	10%	70%	-60%	70%	-60%
2018	0%	69%	-69%	68%	-68%
Compare		10%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	38		11						27	
BLK	21			18							

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
FRL	13	36		10						15	
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	15
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	77
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	78%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
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

Native American Students	
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	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	19
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Based on the 2018-2019 School Improvement Rating data released from DOE, NLC's lowest data component was in math learning gains. During NLC's five years of business, this has consistently proven to be our lowest data point.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 School Improvement Rating data released from DOE, NLC has not shown any declines.

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 the 2018-2019 School Improvement Rating Data released from the DOE, NLC fails to successfully close the gap in reading and math gains, when compared to the State average. Contributing factors to these gaps include: significant student behavior problems, new teachers, transient population, poor student attendance and low parental involvement.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 School Improvement Rating data released from DOE. NLC showed the most improvement in the reading gain component for all subgroups (black/African American, Student with Disabilities & Economically Disadvantaged students).

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

In an attempt to address student course failure and FSA level 1, NLC increased professional development opportunities, implemented new interventions in reading, increased time allocated to mentoring teachers, provided one on one assistance in the classroom and with lesson plan development, instructional strategies and standards based hands on activities. In addition, NLC implemented data meetings.

NLC implemented study groups on campus for teachers working towards certification, paid for FTCE assessments and offered a monetary incentive for becoming highly qualified. We continue to be concerned about all subgroups (black/African American, Students with Disabilities & Economically Disadvantaged students).

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

1. Increase student learning gains in the area of reading.
2. Increase student learning gains in the area of math.
3. Increase quality and rigorous instruction for all subgroups (Black/African American, Students with Disabilities & Economically Disadvantaged students)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: If teachers focus on authentic literacy within subject area delivery, then student learning gains in math will increase a minimum of one grade level as measured by state assessments.

Measurable Outcome: If teachers focus on authentic literacy during the math block by having students read, write, and talk about real-world problems, along with hands-on learning, then math learning gains will increase from 27 to 32 points on the 2020-2021 School Improvement Rating as measured by state assessments and all subgroups will improve by 3 points on the federal index (black/African American, Students with Disabilities & Economically Disadvantaged students).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cassandra Malpica (cassandra.malpica@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize i-Ready, district assessments, and formative assessment data to assist in decision making regarding differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence of effectiveness will include classroom walk-throughs and observations as well as district assessment and i-Ready data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide teachers with meaningful PD opportunities in the areas of differentiated instruction, authentic literacy, and hands on learning.
2. Assist teachers with dis-aggregation of i-Ready data.
3. Provide targeted feedback based on classroom walk throughs.
4. Continual reassessment through frequent and ongoing check-ins with teachers, informal and formal observations, walk throughs and coaching.
5. Specific and targeted mentoring based on teacher identified need.

Person Responsible Katherine Vernon (katherine.vernon@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If teachers provide differentiated instruction, then student learning gains in reading will increase a minimum of one grade level as measured by state assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers focus differentiation during Tier 1 instruction and the MTSS block in order to meet our students where they are, then student learning gains in reading will increase from 46 to 51 points on the 2020-2021 School Improvement Rating as measured by state assessments and all subgroups will improve by 3 points on the federal index (black/African American, Students with Disabilities & Economically Disadvantaged students).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cassandra Malpica (cassandra.malpica@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will participate in professional development opportunities that will assist with the implementation of differentiation, effective teaching practices for students with disabilities, and data driven instruction to better assist with the implementation of tier 1 instruction. Teachers will use i-Ready, district assessment and formative assessment data to assist in decision making regarding differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence of effectiveness will include classrooms walk-throughs and observations as well as district assessment and i-Ready data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide teachers with meaningful PD opportunities in the area of differentiated instruction in the area of Reading.
2. Assist teacher with dis-aggregation of i-Ready data.
3. Provide targeted feedback based on classroom walk-throughs.
4. Progress monitoring meetings will be held to monitor students progress.
5. PST meetings will be held on an as needed basis.

Person Responsible Cassandra Malpica (cassandra.malpica@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.

n/a

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.

Through the following capacity building events, NLC will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission and support the needs of students.

Title 1 annual meeting: October 2020

To provide an explanation of Title 1 and begin the ongoing discussion of school wide participation and its link to student achievement.

Feasting and Fun with First Responders: October 2020

To provide an opportunity for students and families to have a positive experience with the community’s first responders.

Literacy on the Lawn: February 2021

To provide an opportunity for students to engage in literacy activities with their parents.

Flexible Parent and Family Meetings: Ongoing

To afford working parents the opportunity to meet with teachers and staff regarding their child’s academic and behavioral progress.

NLC works to provide a positive school culture for both staff and students. Relationship building is at the core of the program. Staff work hard to build relationships with students and their families. In an attempt to bridge the gap between school and home, parents receive a weekly phone call home from either the student’s teacher or paraprofessional. These phone calls are a time where the student’s weekly successes can be celebrated, and any concerns can be addressed. For many of our students and parents, school has not been a positive experience and these phone calls are an attempt to change that. We work hard to establish open, honest and frequent communication. We want both students and their families to feel safe to express their needs, concerns and struggles. Those needs and struggles can and do typically extend outside of the "normal" school issues and that is okay. NLC works with many community providers to offer wrap around services to assist families with meeting their basic needs--such as, assistance with food, electricity/water, and clothing, obtaining mental health care in the home, rides to doctor appointments and assistance for the holidays. We want our families to feel valued.

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
--	-----------------------------