

Marion County Public Schools

Fort McCoy School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	23
Positive Culture & Environment	29
Budget to Support Goals	30

Fort McCoy School

16160 NE HIGHWAY 315, Fort Mc Coy, FL 32134

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jordan Surdam

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	23
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	30

Fort McCoy School

16160 NE HIGHWAY 315, Fort Mc Coy, FL 32134

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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.

At Fort McCoy School, the staff works together in an environment of mutual respect and understanding toward the common goal of preparing students for a lifetime of learning, productive work, and responsible citizenship by serving the learning needs of the community in both traditional and innovative ways.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fort McCoy School, working together as partners with the total community, will prepare students for the future. We aim to provide an educational program that is academically challenging that includes meaningful instructional strategies and differentiation for all students. Our educational program engages each student by linking curricular content to previous knowledge and experience while remaining exciting enough to promote further exploration of new ideas. We recognize that we cannot reach our goals without the hard work of our Fort McCoy students, parents, and our community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Surdam, Jordan	Principal	The Principal will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. The Principal provides feedback for teachers to improve instruction and tracks data weekly. She oversees the leadership team and delegates tasks such as coaching and modeling for teachers, data collection, collaboration meetings, etc.
Ostanik, Eric	Assistant Principal	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mr. Ostanik will be the lead in instructional materials for teachers and support teacher growth through timely feedback in grades 6-8. He will also be supporting our ESE students through training and by scheduling ESE Paraprofessionals and staff effectively, in order to provide maximum support for our students.
Elder, Dossella	Assistant Principal	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mrs. Elder will be the lead in instructional materials for teachers and support teacher growth through timely feedback in grades 6-8. She will also be supporting our ESE students through training and by scheduling ESE Paraprofessionals and staff effectively in order to provide maximum support for our students. Mrs. Elder will provide ongoing B.E.S.T. Standards professional development through guided, facilitated collaborative planning.
Favors, Jackie	Dean	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mrs. Favors will support systems that support a safe and orderly environment where all students can learn safely. She will monitor discipline data, provide follow-up and mentoring for individual students, lead the PBIS Team, and ensure students feel safe while learning lifelong lessons from discipline incidents that occur.
Blackson, Luke	Dean	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mr. Blackson will support systems that support a safe and orderly environment where all students can learn safely. He will monitor discipline data, provide follow-up and mentoring for individual students, lead the PBIS Team, and ensure students feel safe while learning lifelong lessons from discipline incidents that occur.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hunt, Leona	Reading Coach	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mrs. Hunt models ELA lessons for teachers, support progress monitoring, provides professional development for teachers in the area of Reading and ELA. Collaborative planning will be led by Mrs. Hunt to provide support and modeling in grades K-8 ELA classrooms. In addition, she will support MTSS interventions and support teachers in grades 3-8 with students with disabilities being supported in the inclusion setting.
Rivera, Mary	Teacher, K-12	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mrs. Rivera provides instruction through the AVID program to close the opportunity gap. She models lessons for teachers and provides professional development, incorporating high-yield instructional strategies following the WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading) model.
Taschenberger, Mary	School Counselor	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mrs. Taschenberger will focus on grades PreK - 5 and our self-contained ESE-EBD classroom. She provides small group and individual counseling and tracks student data to ensure adequate progress in being made with her students. She is part of the MDT team, Progress Monitoring Plan meetings, Problem Solving Team meetings, and a member of the school PBIS Team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Jordan Surdam

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.*

2

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

953

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	80	72	74	77	79	76	173	151	150	0	0	0	0	932
Attendance below 90 percent	32	32	37	28	35	32	85	71	80	0	0	0	0	432
One or more suspensions	4	7	5	17	13	11	50	50	51	0	0	0	0	208
Course failure in ELA	14	11	25	8	5	13	47	17	38	0	0	0	0	178
Course failure in Math	16	11	12	8	3	19	38	14	58	0	0	0	0	179
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	57	45	45	0	0	0	0	164
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	18	65	57	50	0	0	0	0	193
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
	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	15	16	22	13	10	27	89	55	79	0	0	0	0	326

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	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	25
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 8/6/2021

2020-21 - 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	51	73	75	80	82	78	184	161	171	0	0	0	0	955
Attendance below 90 percent	19	25	26	17	24	22	69	58	79	0	0	0	0	339
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	1	1	2	12	9	15	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	1	5	9	11	2	3	16	6	20	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	0	5	9	11	2	3	16	6	20	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	65	51	54	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	52	44	46	0	0	0	0	150

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	4	5	4	4	14	65	52	74	0	0	0	0	223

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	5	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

2020-21 - 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	51	73	75	80	82	78	184	161	171	0	0	0	0	955
Attendance below 90 percent	19	25	26	17	24	22	69	58	79	0	0	0	0	339
One or more suspensions	2	2	1	1	1	2	12	9	15	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	1	5	9	11	2	3	16	6	20	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	0	5	9	11	2	3	16	6	20	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	65	51	54	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	52	44	46	0	0	0	0	150

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	4	5	4	4	14	65	52	74	0	0	0	0	223

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	5	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				40%	42%	61%	43%	42%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				40%	45%	59%	49%	48%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	36%	54%	40%	40%	52%
Math Achievement				38%	41%	62%	42%	41%	61%
Math Learning Gains				45%	51%	59%	54%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	43%	52%	42%	44%	52%
Science Achievement				45%	40%	56%	43%	42%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				49%	53%	78%	58%	56%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	58%	44%	14%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	34%	49%	-15%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
06	2021					
	2019	38%	45%	-7%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	36%	46%	-10%	52%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2021					
	2019	47%	50%	-3%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	49%	-2%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	24%	45%	-21%	60%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
06	2021					
	2019	35%	46%	-11%	55%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
07	2021					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	30%	41%	-11%	46%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	38%	44%	-6%	53%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	47%	44%	3%	48%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	51%	65%	-14%	71%	-20%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	86%	54%	32%	61%	25%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Elementary:

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 1-5: I Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Mathematics, Grades 1-5: I Ready Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Science: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Middle:

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 6-8: ELA Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Mathematics Grades 6-8: Math Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Algebra: Algebra Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Geometry: Geometry Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Civics: Civics Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Science: Grade 8 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11/17%	13/19%	32/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/20%	13/22%	27/44%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8%	1/7%	4/27%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/8%	8/12%	31/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/9%	8/13%	26/43%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/7%	5/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10/16%	9/13%	21/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/7%	4/8%	13/25%
	Students With Disabilities	1/17%	0/0	2/25%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/8%	5/7%	20/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/4%	1/2%	11/21%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	3/38%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23/31%	18/24%	23/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/28%	14/22%	19/29%
	Students With Disabilities	3/14%	2/9%	1/4%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/3%	7/9%	17/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/3%	6/9%	15/23%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/5%	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20/27%	11/14%	18/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/22%	5/9%	10/18%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/14%	6/8%	12/15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/11%	2/4%	6/11%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/17%	6/8%	7/9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/13%	4/7%	5/9%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/9%	6/8%	10/13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/4%	4/7%	7/12%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/8%
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	37/54%	25/35%	19/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/51%	17/32%	13/25%
	Students With Disabilities	3/25%	2/17%	1/9%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42 / 30%	35 / 22%	41 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27 / 25%	21 / 17%	23 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 13%	2 / 6%	1 / 3%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	"Math 44 / 31% "	"Math 36 / 22% "	"Math 27 / 17% "
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 30 / 28% "	"Math 23 / 19% "	"Math 15 / 13% "
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 4 / 13% "	"Math 2 / 6% "	"Math 1 / 3% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 0 / 0% "	"Math 0 / 0% "	"Math 0 / 0% "

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60 / 45%	55 / 39%	50 / 36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42 / 41%	38 / 35%	34 / 32%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 22%	3 / 16%	2 / 11%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	"Math 67 / 50% "	"Math 83 / 60% "	"Math 77 / 56% "
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 48 / 46% "	"Math 61 / 56% "	"Math 57 / 53% "
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 10 / 53% "	"Math 7 / 37% "	"Math 6 / 32% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 0 / 0% "	"Math 0 / 0% "	"Math 0 / 0% "
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58 / 45%	64 / 49%	80 / 62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41 / 41%	48 / 44%	59 / 54%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 18%	2 / 11%	4 / 21%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28 / 22%	30 / 22%	42 / 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 / 23%	19 / 19%	27 / 28%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 4%	1 / 4%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	"Math 24 / 28% Algebra 8 / 22% "	"Math 36 / 38% Algebra 7 / 18% "	"Math 45 / 50% Algebra 7 / 18% "
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 22 / 32% Algebra 5 / 23% "	"Math 28 / 38% Algebra 5 / 23% "	"Math 35 / 51% Algebra 3 / 14% "
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 2 / 9% "	"Math 3 / 13% "	"Math 2 / 10% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 0 / 0% "	"Math 1 / 50% "	"Math 1 / 50% "
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	38 / 29%	49 / 35%	56 / 40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24 / 25%	29 / 28%	33 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 13%	1 / 4%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 50%	1 / 50%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	10	30	28	13	36	40	3	22			
HSP	35	41	45	40	57	64	15	33			
MUL	70	69		50	50						
WHT	33	40	30	35	43	46	30	47	54		
FRL	28	38	31	30	43	44	24	46	47		
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	7	35	40	12	40	40	17	29			
HSP	34	49	29	44	50	42	40	82			
MUL	38	30		50	37						
WHT	40	40	33	37	44	36	44	48	46		

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	34	40	34	32	44	35	38	45	42		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	8	29	28	9	36	39	13	17			
HSP	44	55		42	68	83	30	62			
MUL	38	47		50	53						
WHT	43	49	40	42	53	39	42	56	37		
FRL	40	48	38	38	51	43	38	52	32		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
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	361
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
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%	
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%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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%	
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%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Overall, Fort McCoy School ELA proficiency has decreased across grade levels and subgroups from 2018 to 2021. From 2018 to 2021, proficiency, learning gains, and bottom quartile learning gains fell 7 to 8% overall. ELA proficiency for grades 3-8 dropped 8% as well at the state level from 2018-2021. Early Warning System data indicates that 26% of 4th - 8th grade students scored a level 1 on the ELA FSA in 2019.

Overall math achievement decreased 6% from 2018-2021, while learning gains fell 10%. In 2021, our bottom quartile learning gains increased by 4% from 2018 and 9% from 2019. Early Warning System data indicates that 31% of 4th - 8th grade students scored a level 1 on the Math FSA in 2019.

Science achievement has decreased by 13% from 2018-2021. Civics achievement decreased by 10% in a three year time span.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The 2021 state assessments and progress monitoring data demonstrate the greatest need for improvement in the area of English Language Arts. While the 2021 progress monitoring data for grades 1-2 demonstrates improvement, grades 3-8 show an overall decline.

Math progress monitoring data in 3rd - 8th grade demonstrates growth (excluding 6th grade), but not to the accelerated level needed to achieve proficiency. State assessment data in the area of Math shows a decline in achievement and learning gains, but a small improvement (4%) for bottom quartile students from 2018-2021. Bottom quartile learning gains increased by 9% from 2019-2021.

Science progress monitoring data demonstrates a decline in proficiency in grade 5, specifically. Fifth graders declined by 26% from the Fall to the Spring of 2021. This mirrors a decline for grade 5 Science achievement on the state assessment by 7%. Eighth grade made growth in progress monitoring data by 11% from the Fall to the Spring, but showed a decrease in achievement in the state assessment by 15% from 2019-2021.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Since 2018, Fort McCoy School has had a new Principal each school year. 2022 will be the first year since 2018, where the Administrative leadership has been consistent. Fort McCoy currently has 20 teachers with 3 or less years of teaching experience. With nearly 30% of the instructional staff falling into the category of an early career educator, there is a need for increased professional development in the areas of high-yield instructional strategies, lesson planning, and an understanding of the depth and breadth of grade level, content-area standards.

In order to improve in our areas of focus, professional development and collaborative planning opportunities should support all teachers in planning and preparing standards-based lessons with task alignment, incorporating high-yield instructional strategies. While we already implemented facilitated collaborative planning at the elementary level, we will be focusing on planning, implementation, and formative assessment, specifically. Our middle school teachers have not had

collaborative planning opportunities in recent years, due to only one teacher per grade level/content area. This year, we will work with a cooperating middle school to schedule quarterly collaborative planning opportunities for our core middle school teachers.

As the administrative team moves into the second year of leadership at Fort McCoy, relationships of trust have been set in place. Staffing changes were also made, based on 2021 classroom, district, and state assessment data. Consistent classroom observations and regular specific feedback to teachers will positively impact student growth and build teacher capacity.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on progress monitoring data, the most improvement can be found in ELA achievement in grades 1 and 2. Progress monitoring data also shows gains in the area of Math in every grade level, except for grade 6. 2021 State assessment data shows improvement in the area of ELA learning gains (1%) and Math bottom quartile learning gains (9%).

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In 2020-2021, our Literacy Content Area Specialist worked closely with our primary teachers to accelerate foundational reading skills through systematic, explicit phonemic awareness and phonics instruction. Through collaborative planning, lesson study cycles, coaching, and classroom modeling based on the International Literacy Association standards for foundational skill instruction, our primary students made significant learning gains in the area of English Language Arts.

Last year, we were able to add an instructional unit through our Title I budget to deliver Intensive Math instruction using the Math 180 program in grades 6-8. Progress monitoring data from this program demonstrated significant learning gains, further supporting by our 2021 state assessment data.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In the 2021-2022 school year, lesson study cycles will be implemented for all grade levels. Lesson study cycles will be led by our Academic Coaches and provide support in lesson planning, high-yield instructional strategies, and analyzing the impacts on student learning.

In order to provide additional support in the area of Math, a Math Content Area Specialist has been added through our Title I budget. The Math CAS will provide lesson planning support, coaching, modeling, and professional development for math teachers across all grade levels.

Task alignment will be a focus during collaborative planning throughout the school year. Collaborative teams will use a backwards design lesson planning framework to ensure the learning tasks meet the depth of the standard

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will provide professional development in the following areas to accelerate learning for students and support teachers and leaders:

Early Career Educator Cadre - comprised of all teachers within their first three years of teaching, this cadre will meet bi-weekly to ensure retention of teachers. The meetings will focus on classroom management, lesson planning, parent communication, data, etc.

MyView Literacy by SAVVAS - ELA teachers will receive professional development in the new K-12

ELA curriculum, its resources, scope and sequence, assessments, etc.

WICOR Wednesdays - Middle school teachers and select elementary teachers will participate in WICOR Wednesdays. During these professional development opportunities, instructional coaches and teacher leaders will model high-yield instructional strategies for teachers to utilize in the classroom. WICOR strategies incorporate writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading. Instructional Rounds - all K-8 core teachers will participate in at least one cycle of instructional rounds focused on our schoolwide improvement goal of standards-aligned instruction.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

This year, we have added a Math Content Area Specialist to our staffing plan in order to provide mathematics support, classroom coaching, facilitate collaborative planning, and help to sustain growth in student achievement and teacher effectiveness.

We will be working with a neighboring middle school to provide collaborative planning opportunities for our teachers quarterly. We will provide classroom coverage to allow teachers to travel to another campus and plan with teachers in their same grade level/content area. We will work to build relationships and sustain this partnership for future years.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2019, 40% of our teachers earned needs improvement or unsatisfactory state VAM ratings. Currently, we have 20 teachers with 3 or less years of teaching experience on staff. Additionally, ELA and Math student achievement have declined over the past three years (2018-2021). This data strongly supports the need for consistent, specific teacher feedback in order to improve instructional practice and build teacher capacity.

If the administrative team provides teachers with consistent, timely, specific feedback, then instructional practice will improve and student achievement will increase by 3% in every tested area, as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment and End of Course examinations.

ELA Achievement – 35% to 38%

ELA Learning Gains – 41% to 44%

ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains – 32% to 35%

Math Achievement – 36% to 39%

Measurable Outcome: Math Learning Gains – 44% to 47%

Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains – 46% to 49%

Science Achievement – 30% to 33%

Civics Achievement – 48% to 51%

Acceleration – 49% to 52%

ESSA Subgroups below 41%

Students with Disabilities - 28% to 31%

Multiracial - 39% to 42%

Economically Disadvantaged - 38% to 41%

Monitoring: The administrative team will utilize a shared document to schedule regular walkthroughs. This shared document will also allow the administrative team to document classroom visits and share feedback given to individual teachers. Student assessment data will also be utilized to monitor progress towards the desired outcome (iReady, QSMA, Core Phonics survey, formative assessments, check for understanding, FSA, EOCs, etc.)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The administrative team will regularly visit classrooms, monitor instruction, and provide specific teacher feedback on instructional practice. Feedback will be provided in a variety of ways, including notes in the classroom, emails, face-to-face conversations, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie's 2018 updated list of factors related to student achievement ranks feedback as one of the high-yield instructional strategies for positively impacting student achievement, with an effect size of 0.70. With nearly 30% of our instructional staff in their first three years of teaching, targeted feedback is essential to building teacher capacity and improving instructional practice.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a schedule of bi-weekly administrative walkthroughs for the administrative team, using a shared document.

Person Responsible: Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Meet bi-weekly as an administrative team to review data from walkthroughs, discuss feedback provided to teachers, and create plans for support as needed.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Utilize instructional coach to support teachers based on walkthrough data and feedback provided.

Person Responsible Leona Hunt (leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Fort McCoy School has maintained a school grade of a C since 2015, but fell to a D in 2021. Fort McCoy School earned 42% of the total points for school grade calculation in 2019. In 2021, Fort McCoy students showed a decline in every school grade component, except for a slight increase in ELA learning gains (1%) and acceleration (1%) and a 9% gain in bottom quartile learning gains in the area of Math. The decline in proficiency across all tested content areas, resulted in Fort McCoy School earning 40% of the total points, a 2% decline from 2019.</p> <p>Since 2018, state assessment data has shown an 8% decline in English Language Arts achievement in grades 3-8. District and classroom assessment data further supports the overall decline in ELA proficiency. Reading proficiency is linked to student performance in all subject areas.</p> <p>Since 2018, state assessment data has shown a 6% decline in Math achievement in grades 3-8. Additionally, Math learning gains have declined by 10% since 2018. District and classroom assessment data further supports the overall decline in Math proficiency.</p> <p>Currently, Fort McCoy School has three ESSA subgroups falling below the 41% threshold, including Economically Disadvantaged (38%), Multiracial (39%), and Students with Disabilities (28%).</p> <p>Standards-aligned instruction guides the lesson planning, implementation, and assessment of student learning in academic and elective content areas.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>If teachers are provided with collaborative planning opportunities, with a focus on task alignment and formative assessment, then student achievement will increase by 3% in all areas, as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment and End of Course assessments.</p> <p>ELA Achievement – 35% to 38% ELA Learning Gains – 41% to 44% ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains – 32% to 35% Math Achievement – 36% to 39% Math Learning Gains – 44% to 47% Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains – 46% to 49% Science Achievement – 30% to 33% Civics Achievement – 48% to 51% Acceleration – 49% to 52%</p> <p>ESSA subgroups Economically Disadvantaged - 38% to 41% Multiracial - 39% to 42% Students with Disabilities - 28% to 31%</p>
Monitoring:	<p>A school administrator will participate in collaborative planning. Monthly classroom walkthrough data, as well as District and state assessment data (such as iReady Diagnostic, iReady Progress Monitoring, FSA, MTSS, QSMA, etc.) will be used to monitor the effectiveness of standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will utilize formative assessment data to drive instruction with administration monitoring implementation through regular walkthroughs. Subgroup data will be monitored regularly through data digs.</p>
Person responsible for	<p>Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)</p>

**monitoring
outcome:****Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Collective teacher efficacy is defined as the belief that teachers can more positively impact the learning of their students if they work as a team. Collaborative planning, with a focus on task alignment, formative assessment, will positively impact collective teacher efficacy, thus improving student achievement.

Rationale**for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

John Hattie's 2018 updated list of factors related to student achievement identified collective teacher efficacy as the new number one factor in increasing student achievement, with an effect size of 1.57.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a master schedule that allows for collaborative planning time.

Person

Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Coordinate with a neighboring middle school to provide quarterly opportunities for middle school teachers to collaborate with other teachers with the same grade level/content area. Due to the small population of our middle school, we only have one core subject area teacher per grade level, making true collaboration difficult.

Person

Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Administrators and instructional coaches will be present during collaborative planning opportunities to facilitate conversations and focus on planning (B.E.S.T. Standards, Florida Standards, item clarifications and specifications, learning task alignment), implementation (high-yield instructional strategies), and assessment (formative assessment, check for understanding, iReady Diagnostic assessment, QSMA's, FSA).

Person

Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Schedule regular walkthroughs by administration to collect data to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of collaborative planning opportunities.

Person

Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Fort McCoy School has maintained a school grade of a C since 2015, but fell to a D in 2021. Fort McCoy School earned 42% of the total points for school grade calculation in 2019. Since 2018, state assessment data has shown an 8% decline in English Language Arts achievement in grades 3-8. District and classroom assessment data further supports the overall decline in ELA proficiency Kindergarten through 5th grade. Reading proficiency is linked to student performance in all subject areas.

Measurable Outcome: If teachers are provided with professional development in the area of ELA Lesson Study, then student achievement and learning gains will increase by 3% in ELA, as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.

ELA Achievement – 35% to 38%
ELA Learning Gains – 41% to 44%

Monitoring: A school administrator will participate in all lesson study cycles. Monthly classroom walkthrough data, as well as District and state assessment data (such as iReady Diagnostic, iReady Progress Monitoring, FSA, MTSS, QSMA, etc.) will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leona Hunt (leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Lesson study focuses on student engagement and task alignment. It provides a valuable experience for teachers to investigate student learning, without the need to manage students. Lesson study allows teachers to collectively plan a lesson, observe, and reflect upon the lesson's effectiveness. Lesson study allows teachers to enjoy the satisfaction of classroom research and to influence education broadly through their own research lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to the 2013 report on PD by the National School Boards Association's Center for Public Education, "Most teachers only experience traditional, workshop-based professional development, even though research shows it is ineffective. Over 90 percent of teachers participate in workshop-style training sessions during a school year. This stands in stark contrast to teachers' minimal exposure to other forms of professional development. Despite its prevalence, the workshop model's track record for changing teachers' practice and student achievement is abysmal. Short, one-shot workshops often don't change teacher practice and have no effect on student achievement."

The Learning Policy Institute identifies seven widely shared features of effective PD. These include, content-focused, incorporates active learning, supports collaboration in job-embedded context, uses models and modeling of effective practice, provides coaching/expert support, offers feedback/reflection, and is of sustained duration. The Lesson Study format incorporates six of seven of these indicators for effective PD.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a master schedule of lesson study opportunities for grades K-5.

Person Responsible Leona Hunt (leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

Literacy Content Area Specialist to facilitate Lesson Study cycles.

Person Responsible Leona Hunt (leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

Plan for coverage for K-5 teachers to engage in planning, observation, and reflection sessions.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Within a week after the lesson study cycle, the Administrative team follows up with walk-throughs to monitor impact of Lesson Study and provides individual teacher feedback.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

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.

Fort McCoy School builds a positive school culture and environment by regularly communicating with all stakeholders throughout the year, including teachers, students, families, volunteers, business partner, and school advisory council. We understand that our stakeholders play an essential role in school success and ensuring equity for all. Family engagement events and meetings will be scheduled in a flexible format (ex: different days and times) and when necessary, meetings and/or events will be duplicated at different times/days allowing for maximum family and community participation. English language translators will be available for our parents as needed through our bilingual staff members. We will also provide school event documents in English and Spanish. Our school facility is ADA accessible. If support is needed to accommodate a disability, appropriate arrangements will be made by the school. We will utilize our Home School Liaison to maximize communication with students and families in regards to attendance, academics, behavior, etc.

As a PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Supports) school, we have schoolwide expectations, focusing on positive behaviors and reinforcements. We offer parent engagement opportunities throughout the year to build parent and family capacity in supporting their child's education.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

School Business Partners stay involved by attending and participating in our School Advisory Council meetings, attending school events, providing resources for our staff and students, and by supporting our school's vision and mission.

Community members are encouraged and welcome to learn about our school and provide support within the classroom by reading with students, sharing about career options, and supporting our 3 E focus - enrollment, enlistment, employment.

Family members attend School Advisory Council meetings, Parent Conference Nights, and other family engagement nights and volunteer at a variety of events.

District personnel frequently visit classrooms and meet with administration.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00