

Marion County Public Schools

North Marion Middle School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

North Marion Middle School

2085 W HIGHWAY 329, Citra, FL 32113

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: James Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

North Marion Middle School

2085 W HIGHWAY 329, Citra, FL 32113

[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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	75%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

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.

North Marion Middle School will provide a quality academic program that prepares students to become responsible and successful in our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Striving for academic excellence in student performance through empowering students to take ownership of their learning.

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
Ellers, David	Principal	The Principal is In charge of all aspects of the operation of North Marion Middle School. This includes but is not limited to: supervision of all employees, instructional leadership, supervision of all students, compliance with local, state, and federal rules and laws, and school finances.
Gamoneda, Sheila	Assistant Principal	The duties are to primarily be in charge of curriculum and scheduling of students. They also directly supervise the guidance department and assists the principal in all aspects of the operation of the school.
Norton, Keven	Assistant Principal	He will maintain a high structured/high supportive learning environment. He supports principal in all aspects of the operation of the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/22/2021, James Johnson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

752

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

5

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	241	270	231	0	0	0	0	742	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	95	91	0	0	0	0	273	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	73	57	0	0	0	0	221	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	136	83	0	0	0	0	327	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	111	105	0	0	0	0	327	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	77	56	0	0	0	0	200	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	87	60	0	0	0	0	227	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	156	128	0	0	0	0	428	

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	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	15	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/17/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	269	287	269	0	0	0	0	825
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	97	98	0	0	0	0	253
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	84	0	0	0	0	170
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	70	72	0	0	0	0	145
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	70	71	0	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	83	62	0	0	0	0	218
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	91	68	0	0	0	0	244

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	26	28	0	0	0	0	84

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	269	287	269	0	0	0	0	825
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	97	98	0	0	0	0	253
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	84	0	0	0	0	170
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	70	72	0	0	0	0	145
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	70	71	0	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	83	62	0	0	0	0	218
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	91	68	0	0	0	0	244

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	26	28	0	0	0	0	84

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 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				43%	49%	54%	40%	47%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	54%	54%	52%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	46%	47%	46%	45%	47%
Math Achievement				49%	54%	58%	41%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains				56%	58%	57%	55%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	50%	51%	41%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				34%	46%	51%	33%	46%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				65%	70%	72%	60%	66%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	39%	45%	-6%	54%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	40%	46%	-6%	52%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
08	2021					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	44%	46%	-2%	55%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	54%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2021					
	2019	54%	41%	13%	46%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	35%	44%	-9%	48%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	62%	65%	-3%	71%	-9%
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	96%	54%	42%	61%	35%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	51%	49%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

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 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64/30	39/17	39/19
	Economically Disadvantaged	44/27	26/15	26/16
	Students With Disabilities	2/7	2/7	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/17	2/25	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51/26	35/16	35/17
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/21	20/11	21/13
	Students With Disabilities	2/8	1/4	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/13

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	102/46	76/31	59/26
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/42	52/28	40/23
	Students With Disabilities	6/20	2/5	2/6
	English Language Learners	2/20	2/15	1/8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	"Math 84 / 43% Algebra 10 / 40% "	"Math 90 / 42% Algebra 11 / 44% "	"Math 73 / 36% Algebra 10 / 42% "
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 69 / 45% Algebra 6 / 46% "	"Math 67 / 39% Algebra 6 / 46% "	"Math 52 / 32% Algebra 5 / 42% "
	Students With Disabilities	10/26	11/27	11/28
	English Language Learners	5/45	3/23	2/15
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	85/38	84/38	89/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/32	50/27	53/30
	Students With Disabilities	7/19	6/15	5/13
	English Language Learners	3/25	3/21	2/14

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37/19	48/23	41/21
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/13	29/19	25/18
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/4	2/8
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/17	1/17
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	"Math 58 / 45% Algebra 9 / 26% Geo 16 / 67%"	"Math 86 / 58% Algebra 6 / 18% Geo 21 / 88%"	"Math 62 / 44% Algebra 6 / 18% Geo 18 / 75%"
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 42 / 42% Algebra 7 / 30% Geo 8 / 80%"	"Math 63 / 54% Algebra 5 / 22% Geo 9 / 90%"	"Math 45 / 41% Algebra 5 / 22% Geo 7 / 70%"
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 13 / 48% "	"Math 15 / 48% "	"Math 10 / 33% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 3 / 60% Algebra 0 / 0% "	"Math 3 / 60% Algebra 0 / 0% "	"Math 2 / 40% Algebra 0 / 0% "
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47/27	73/34	68/35
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/22	45/29	41/30
	Students With Disabilities	1/4	4/14	2/8
	English Language Learners	1/25	1/17	0/0

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	7	26	27	7	23	31	3	12			
ELL	27	48	38	24	34	33	14	31			
BLK	16	28	25	17	22	25	9	21	35		
HSP	42	50	41	38	39	44	27	48	62		
MUL	50	74		50	40						
WHT	44	43	31	46	40	31	39	57	71		
FRL	27	36	28	27	31	30	20	38	55		

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	10	32	26	19	45	30	9	27			
ELL	12	47	64	29	48	43		61			
BLK	24	43	38	29	51	41	18	49	38		
HSP	38	55	50	50	57	54	30	69	70		
MUL	61	54		72	68		55	70			
WHT	57	55	46	61	57	42	46	74	68		
FRL	40	50	40	46	54	43	30	64	63		
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	10	35	35	10	36	32	10	30			
ELL	15	40	55	10	41	47	13	31			
BLK	26	47	43	27	48	37	20	46	82		
HSP	46	52	50	44	59	50	43	57	79		
MUL	51	44		51	63		25	85			
WHT	46	55	47	48	56	40	36	68	72		
FRL	37	49	44	38	53	40	32	56	73		

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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	22
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	54
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	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
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?

Based on results from the 2021 FSA, our school struggled in all tested areas and in all grades compared to scores in 2019. Learning gains were also down significantly in all tested areas. Reading proficiency dropped from 43% to 34%, learning gains dropped from 51% to 41%. Lowest Quartile learning gains dropped from 43% to 31%.

Mathematics achievement dropped from 49% to 35%, learning gains dropped from 56% to 34%. Lowest Quartile learning gains dropped for 45% to 32%.

Both science and social studies had significant drops. Science scores dropped from 34% to 27%. Civics scores dropped from 65% to 44%.

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

Based on a comparison of the 2019 and 2021 FSA results, learning gains in mathematics and reading were the areas most impacted, with mathematics dropping by 14 points and reading dropping by 10 points. Students in the lowest quartile dropped by double digits, math dropping by 13 points and reading by 12 points. This is reflected in other progress monitoring data.

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

Instructional practice lagged for the past year and a half. Student engagement appeared to be low. North Marion Middle School had the highest number of course failures of middle schools in our district. Significant numbers of students enrolled in the online learning model did not actively participate in classes.

A re-focus on the basics of highly effective instruction is necessary. Low performance in all tested areas indicate that the problem is not isolated to teaching in one subject, but indicates instructional improvement is needed across the board. We will provide training on high impact instructional strategies and monitor that these strategies are implemented.

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

There literally was not any improvement as indicated by our data. Every assessed area demonstrated decreased performance compared to prior years. Our area that lost the least was science achievement.

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

Our strongest teachers in science did best on the test. Scheduling has ensured that most students have these teachers for science.

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

We will focus on high impact teaching strategies, the integration of literacy in all content areas, and implementing intensive reading and math interventions with fidelity.

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 begin our professional development with planning for instruction to ensure that we are prepared to provide high-interest/high-rigor instruction. This will include how to establish rigorous learning targets aligned to standards, development of high rigor student learning tasks, and checks for understanding that measure mastery of the learning targets. We will also provide training on how to infuse reading and writing into content area lessons as both a way to improve student engagement as well as boosting the rigor of student task.

We will also closely monitor all intervention programs in reading and mathematics for fidelity. We are implementing the District Reading Initiatives and will conduct regular walkthroughs with fidelity checklists to ensure the programs are implemented properly. Feedback and regular training will be offered to teachers based on the data and information collected during these fidelity checks.

In mathematics, we are implementing Math 180 for students needing intensive remediation and I Ready mathematics. Teachers will be trained on implementation during pre-school and early in the year. Again the administrative team will conduct regular walkthroughs with fidelity checklists to ensure the programs are implemented properly. Feedback and regular training will be offered to teachers based on the data and information collected during these fidelity checks.

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

We will continue to focus on high impact instructional strategies and monitoring our interventions closely. Feedback and further training in these focus areas will be ongoing. New teachers will be trained in these focus areas.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data indicates a general lack of student learning across all subject areas. Performance in all assessed areas lagged the state and district averages on FSA and EOC exams. Teacher observations indicate a lack of rigor in student task, vague learning targets and a failure to conduct formative assessments. Our school also had the highest number of failed courses in the district. It is clear that we need to improve in planning and instructional delivery.
Measurable Outcome:	Improved instruction will result in improved student outcomes reflected in QSMA results, iReady assessments, student grades and performance on FSA and state EOC exams. Specifically, improved instructional practice will result in a 3% gain in performance on QSMA scores over 2020-21. iReady assessments in math and reading will improve by 3% over last year's performance beginning with the December assessments. Additionally, FSA scores measuring reading and math proficiency will improve by 3% over 2021 results. FSA one year's growth scores will improve in math and reading for both lowest quartile students and all students by 10%. Scores measuring reading and math proficiency for ELL students will increase by 3% over 2021 FSA results. Scores measuring reading and math proficiency for Black/African students will increase by 3% over 2021 FSA results. Scores measuring reading and math proficiency for Students with Disabilities (SWD) will increase by 5% over 2021 FSA results.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored using regular classroom visits to monitor common boards, instruction, and student task. We will also regularly collect lesson plans to monitor for use of high impact learning strategies. Artifact walks and discussions will be conducted with a focus on rigor of student task.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be trained on high impact teaching strategies. This includes: implementation of common boards with fidelity, training on aligning student task with learning objectives, planning for higher order questioning, implementing formative assessment, and integrating reading and writing in all content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The significant drop in student achievement across all content areas indicate that we need to reset instruction. Focus on these areas is proven (Hattie, Marzano, Schmoker, etc.) to improve student learning outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide training on Standards Focus Boards. Training will included setting instructional objective aligned to standards and formative assessment.

Person Responsible David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)

Conduct walk-throughs to ensure the Standards Focus Boards are compliant with district mandates. Provide feedback on elements of board.

Person Responsible David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Instructional Rounds monthly with an emphasis on student task. Provide training to staff on student task aligned to standards.

Person Responsible David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)

Do artifact collection in each classroom quarterly. Bring the artifacts into common planning meetings to discuss rigor of student task.

Person Responsible Keven Norton (keven.norton@marion.k12.fl.us)

Federal Index Subgroups: ELL, SWD, and African American students are included in this priority. For ELL students, ESOL paraprofessionals will work one-on-one with students in deficient areas. Our students with disabilities will also have one-on-one time with paraprofessionals and Inclusion teachers. In all classes, our African American students will receive support from teachers and paraprofessionals in their areas of weakness. Additionally, students in these "At Risk" groups will be supported through our Home School Liaison actively communicating with the families of these students.

Person Responsible David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data indicate a general lack of student achievement in mathematics. Performance in all grade levels lagged the state and district averages on FSA district QSMA's. Students demonstrate learning gaps that need closing and weakness in foundational math skills. Data indicates that our lowest performing students need additional supports to close achievement gaps in mathematics.

Measurable Outcome: Systemic mathematics remediation will result in improved student outcomes reflected in QSMA results, iReady assessments, student grades and performance on FSA. Specifically, mathematics remediation will result in a 3% gain in performance on QSMA scores over 2020-21. iReady assessments in math will improve by 3% over last year's performance beginning with the December assessments. Additionally, FSA math proficiency will improve by 3% over 2021 results. FSA one year's growth scores will improve in math for both lowest quartile students and all students by 10%. Scores measuring math proficiency for ELL students will increase by 3% over 2021 FSA results. Scores measuring math proficiency for Black/African students will increase by 3% over 2021 FSA results. Scores measuring math proficiency for Students with Disabilities (SWD) will increase by 5% over 2021 FSA results.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored using regular classroom visits to monitor the use of I-Ready Software. Walk-throughs of the Math 180 classroom will be conducted to ensure fidelity of implementation of the program. Both Math 180 and I-Ready have robust monitoring tools that will be utilized to ensure fidelity of implementation of the software components.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: North Marion Middle School math teachers will utilize I-Ready mathematics software with each student in "regular" math classes for 45 minutes per week. Student who scored in the lowest quartile on 5th grade mathematics will participate in Math 180 instruction. Both programs are research based and utilized in our district. Data from both programs will be used to provide additional differentiated instruction in a small group setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Year's growth data in math, including our lowest quartile students showed the lowest gains in years. Clearly, student performance in math must improve.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify and schedule students who need remediation (Math 180 Class).

Person Responsible Sheila Gamoneda (sheila.gamoneda@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor for implementation of Math 180 for fidelity.

Person Responsible David Eilers (david.eilers@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor data on students in remediation using all data points (QSMA, I-Ready assessments, Math 180 software component).

Person Responsible Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

Implement and train teachers on I-Ready software and Teacher Tool Box.

Person Responsible Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor implementation data, particularly student engagement time per week. "Expect 45"

Person Responsible David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)

Meet with teachers to discuss data results on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible David Ellers (david.ellers@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor data on students participating in I-Ready math instruction using all data points (QSMA, I-Ready assessments, Math 180 software component).

Person Responsible Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

Federal Index Subgroups: ELL, SWD, and African American students are included in this priority. For ELL students, ESOL paraprofessionals will work one-on-one with students in deficient areas. Our students with disabilities will also have one-on-one time with paraprofessionals and Inclusion teachers. In all classes, our African American students will receive support from teachers and paraprofessionals in their areas of weakness. The use of i-Ready with these students will provide additional practice and remediation at their individual instructional level in math, reinforcing instruction received in the mathematics classroom. Additionally, students in these "At Risk" groups will be supported through our Home School Liaison actively communicating with the families of these students.

Person Responsible David Ellers (david.ellers@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.

Data indicates that North Marion Middle School is a safe learning environment. We are below the state average in serious misbehavior such as fighting and property destruction. An area in need of improvement is our suspension rate which is higher than the state average and leads our district.

We will work with teachers who have high referral rate; providing training in classroom management strategies. Our PBIS committee has planned a variety of incentives for student behavior including continuation of our PBIS/FANS field days from last year.

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.

Three major initiatives have been established to address positive school culture and our learning environment. First, we are enhancing our PBIS program to recognize and improve student behavior. Our PBIS committee has established a schedule of PBIS events through the school year to reward and recognize students who are doing the right thing on a regular basis. We will continue to implement our mental health curriculum to support this effort including our award-winning SAVE Promise Club program.

Second, we will utilize our new Home School Liaison to mentor students who are struggling with attendance and behavior issues. He will meet with these students regularly and provide support and feedback to our students and their families. We will expand our parent night programs, which were severely limited last year.

Finally, we continue to promote a high-structure/high-support learning environment. We will monitor and enforce school-wide expectations and ensure appropriate consequences are issued to students who choose not to follow these norms. This will be done in conjunction with the supportive steps listed above to create a positive structured learning environment.

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

All school community members have a role to play in making our school culture positive, productive and student focused. Staff members, regardless of role or job description, are critical in setting an atmosphere.

Students are at the core of this positive environment. Students strive to "Do what's right, Do your best, and Treat others the way you want to be treated." Our SAVE Promise Club endeavors to help students do this on a daily basis.

Staff members set a tone for the school through their interactions with students. Maintaining a high structure/high support learning environment is critical for establishing a great learning environment. Our clerical team sets a tone of friendliness and assistance through their interactions with parents and students.

Finally, parents and community members are critical for our success. Parents must feel welcome at school and support the efforts of staff to create a high-structure/high-support learning environment. We will work to create partnerships with parents in helping their child be successful.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00