

Marion County Public Schools

Marion Charter 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Marion Charter School

39 CEDAR RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Axson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Marion Charter School

39 CEDAR RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[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)
Elementary School KG-5	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	Yes	65%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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 Marion Charter School, we will strive to guide students to become respectful citizens, successful problem solvers, and life long learners who value themselves and others.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Marion Charter School, we envision a school that supports and nourishes the unique personality and gifts of each child, where students and staff members greet each day with enthusiasm, and where success and challenges are expected and enjoyed.

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
Axson, Michelle	Principal	Mrs. Axson, the Principal oversees the daily operation of the school from personnel and students, as well as the budget.
Wells, Valerie	School Counselor	Ms. Wells, our Guidance Counselor/Dean, develops, coordinates and conducts all individual, small group and schoolwide guidance and social behavior activities. She also addresses discipline issues that occur on campus.
Hinerman, Alison	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Hinerman, our ESE/Gifted Teacher and RTI Specialist, provides services to our ESE and Gifted students, and works closely with teachers regarding their students who have IEPs or 504 Plans. She also coordinates and works with teachers to provide RTI interventions to our struggling students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/26/2021, Michelle Axson

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.*

14

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

14

Total number of students enrolled at the school

214

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

0

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

0

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	32	33	33	32	32	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
Attendance below 90 percent	6	7	3	6	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	6	11	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	2	7	7	0	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

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

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	1	4	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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

Wednesday 6/30/2021

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	31	30	38	34	34	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	31	30	38	34	34	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	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				59%	47%	57%	51%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	56%	58%	32%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	52%	53%	19%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	51%	63%	71%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	58%	62%	68%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	49%	51%	50%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	47%	53%	66%	51%	55%

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	59%	44%	15%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	45%	14%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	49%	24%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	67%	54%	13%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	70%	45%	25%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	44%	13%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

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 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: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6 / 19%	6/19%	10/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 22%	4/17%	6/26%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/19%	4/13%	9/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/22%	4/17%	6/26%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8/24%	6/18%	10/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/30%	3/14%	4/19%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	1/10%	10/10%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/12%	1/3%	4/12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/15%	1/5%	2/10%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	1/10%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18/60%	9/29%	13/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/50%	5/22%	8/35%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1/3%	0 / 0%	9/28
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/5%	0 / 0%	5/22
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/38%	7/22%	9/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/38%	6/29%	5/24%
	Students With Disabilities	1/33%	1/33%	2/67%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/16%	3/10%	6/19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/19%	2/10%	6/30%
	Students With Disabilities	1/33%	1/33%	1/33%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8/20%	5/13%	6/15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/10%	2/10%	2/10%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	1/14%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/10%	4/10%	7/18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/10%	2/10%	2/10%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	1/14%	1/14%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	22/55%	16/40%	12/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/55%	9/45%	5/26%
	Students With Disabilities	2/29%	2/29%	2/29%
	English Language Learners	1/50%	2/100%	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	38			38							
BLK	53	42		53	25		17				
HSP	42			46							
WHT	69	53		57	67		36				
FRL	44	38		46	31		11				
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	35	50		61	50						
BLK	57	50		63	63						
HSP	61	71		70	53						
WHT	63	71		73	61		71				
FRL	60	65	40	70	59		54				
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	14	7		36	47		60				
BLK	38	21		52	43						
HSP	21	15		68	69						
WHT	61	38		78	74		69				
FRL	48	35	15	73	73	50	64				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	220
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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 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	38
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	56
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	34
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?

In 2019, our scores in 3rd, 4th, and 5th in both reading and math, showed growth and surpassed both the county and the state. For the 2020-21 school year, for ELA, our 3rd graders surpassed both the county and the state with 69% proficiency as opposed to the County (44%) and the State (54%). Our 4th grade students surpassed the County with 45% proficiency, as opposed to the County (42%). Our 4th grade proficiency level was below the State's (52%). Our 5th grade students also surpassed the County with 53% proficiency compared to the County (47%). Our 5th grade students were slightly below the State's 54% proficiency score.

For Math, our 3rd graders again greatly surpassed the county and the state with 69% proficiency, as compared to the County (45%) and the State (51%). For 4th grade, 48% of our students were proficient, which was the same as the County, and slightly below the state (53%). Our 5th graders were below the county and state averages, with 43% proficiency compared to the County (49%) and the State (51%).

For Science, our 5th grade students were well below the county and state averages with 23% proficiency, as compared to the County (40%) and the State (47%).

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

Based on our progress monitoring data, Science continued to drop throughout the 2020-21 school year from 59% to 52%. When comparing the QSMA data to our 3 year trend in FSA, our science scores dropped from 35% to 20% causing a need for improvement. We will make Science our major focus this year as well as continuing to focus on reading and math.

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

The contributing factors for the need in improvement were teacher preparedness as well as much needed updated Science curriculum. Last year, our new 5th grade teacher was inexperienced with teaching the standards effectively. She would benefit from extra support and professional development, as well as a mentor.

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

Our learning gains in ELA showed the most growth over the past several years by going from 32% to 65%. We had our ESE/Gifted/RTI aide provide additional remediation support above the standard MTSS support. She worked with 3rd-5th graders on a daily basis. Will continue this practice for the 2021-22 school year.

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

Our teachers focused on both Reading and math state standards when teaching their students. We also continued to implement daily remediation in all subject areas. We will conduct bi-weekly collaboration meetings with grade level teams to disseminate student and grade level data. and to provide strategies and support to all teachers and staff. We will also have cross grade level meetings once a month so that teachers can share their strategies and ideas with each other.

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

For the 2021-22 school year, we are implementing the new MyView Reading Curriculum, as well as, continuing with the Go Math! curriculum, while closely following the state standards. We have restructured our MTSS time to first thing in the morning school wide so that we can utilize all staff members to assist our Tier II and Tier III students. We will also implement the STEAM activities in all classes. I will conduct weekly walkthroughs to observe how instruction is going and how the Administrative Team can be of assistance

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.

For the 2021-2022 school year, we will continue to provide robust, data driven professional development to all of our teachers and staff such as how to implement Science standards in an effective way through STEAM activities. We will continue to provide both District and school based professional development opportunities throughout the school year. Teachers and staff will continue to also choose their own professional development opportunities that fit their personal educational needs and interests.

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 meet with the teachers once a month and after each assessment period to review student data through our Data Chats. During this meeting, we will continue to offer support and suggestions on how to assist the needs of both the teacher and students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A downward trend in student achievement in Science as measured by NGSS data, demonstrates a weakness in standards based instructional practice. For Science, our 5th grade students were well below the county and state averages with 23% proficiency, as compared to the County (40%) and the State (47%).
Measurable Outcome:	Through implementation of effective and rigorous standards based instruction in Science, then student learning gains and proficiencies will increase by at least 30% going from 23% to 53%.
Monitoring:	The Administrator and members of the Administrative Team will continuously review student data and will conduct monthly Data Chats with each teacher to discuss student strengths and weaknesses. During this time, we discuss QSMA scores, weekly Science Quiz/Test scores and provide support and suggestions that will be given to the teachers in regards to how to better serve the struggling students and how to support the enriched students as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use collaborative planning using Florida State Standards to support standards based instruction, as well continuing to provide additional remediation support to our 3rd-5th grade teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategy 0.009 (Teacher Subject Matter Knowledge), this strategy is perfect at supporting this rationale. This strategy was implemented last year in reading, which contributed to our continued growth. We will continue to implement this in all academic areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide robust standards based professional development to our teachers and aides.
2. Schedule collaborative planning times for grade levels in order to develop strong lessons and activities.

Person Responsible Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In order to try to accommodate all parents, especially the parents who still could not attend due to work or personal schedules, we will continue to offer multiple days and times for all of our meetings. We will also post the information on our website; school based social media page, and DOJO. We will also try this year to post videos/webinars of the information that was given at the meetings so that parents can view at their earliest convenience.

Measurable Outcome: If we focus parent and family engagement activities on ELA, Math, and measurable Science standards and build a strong foundation for two-way communication with families, then student learning gains will increase based on local assessments and diagnostic data. Based on current data from our Parent Surveys, we will increase our Parent Involvement turn out by 45%.

Monitoring: Surveys will given out at the beginning of the school year that will ask parents what types of Parent Activities would be beneficial to their families and what times would be helpful to their schedules. Also, after each Family Engagement Meeting and Activities, surveys will be given out, so that the Administrator and Administrative Team can see how they can improve the training or activity, but also how they an be of further assistance to the parent's and student's needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We sent out a survey to parents to see how we can better serve them, and it was stated that we should have more parent nights. Due to COVID restrictions last year, it is our focus this year to offer both face to face on online meetings and Family Night Activities. We will also continue to provide several different days and times to meet the needs of our families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on the parent surveys, parents stated that they would benefit from attending more hands-on classes or meetings to learn how to help their children at home with their academic class and homework.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide "hands on" meetings for parents and students for Math Night, Reading Night, and Science Night. We will also send home these same activities with students whose parents choose to attend these meetings virtually.
2. Provide parents with many forms of communication such as our webiste, DOJO, Facebook, etc.
3. We will offer our parents several days and times of the activities, if applicable, so that our activities can better meet their schedules.

Person Responsible Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus The past FSA and QSMA data reflects a need for more support for our Multiple Subgroups in order to meet their reading, math, and science needs. For 3rd grade ELA, the Subgroup ED had a proficiency rate of 57% compared to non ED students (68%), the subgroup LEP had a proficiency rate of 50% compared to non LEP (61%), and SWD had a proficiency rate of 56% compared to non SWD (60%). For 4th grade ELA, ED students had a proficiency rate of 45% compared to non ED (46%), subgroup LEP had a proficiency rate of 48% compared to non LEP (45%), and SWD subgroup had a proficiency of 56% compared to non SWD (69%). For 5th grade ELA, the subgroup ED had a proficiency rate of 60% compared to non ED (69%), the subgroup LEP had a proficiency rate of 69% compared to non LEPs(64%), and the subgroup SWD had a proficiency rate of 46% compared to non SWD (69%).

Description and Rationale: For 3rd grade Math, the Subgroup ED had a proficiency rate of 63% compared to non ED students (74%), the subgroup LEP had a proficiency rate of 63% compared to non LEP (66%), and SWD had a proficiency rate of 73% compared to non SWD (65%). For 4th grade Math, ED students had a proficiency rate of 46% compared to non ED (37%), subgroup LEP had a proficiency rate of 37% compared to non LEP (43%), and SWD subgroup had a proficiency of 43% compared to non SWD (43%). For 5th grade Math, the subgroup ED had a proficiency rate of 52% compared to non ED (58%), the subgroup LEP had a proficiency rate of 56% compared to non LEPs(55%), and the subgroup SWD had a proficiency rate of 54% compared to non SWD (55%).

For 5th grade Science, the subgroup ED had a proficiency rate of 37% compared to non ED (48%). The subgroup SWD had a proficiency rate of 37% compared to non SWD (45%).

Measurable Outcome: If the RTI team, teachers, and aides provide extra remediation support to our subgroup students, using robust educational materials on a daily basis, then hopefully their FSA and QSMA proficiency scores will increase by 20%.

Monitoring: We will monitor our subgroup students on a weekly basis, as well as after each district assessment, to see if there needs to be any adjustments to their remediation schedule and/or support materials. Our Progress Monitoring is facilitated through our PMP meetings, Administrative Walk Throughs, and Individual meetings with teachers. We also monitor the specific child on a weekly basis through teacher observations and test scores to ensure that their needs are continuing to be met.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative planning among the RTI team, teachers, and aides, using Florida State Standards to support standards based instruction, as well as continuing to provide additional remediation support to our subgroup students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Hattie's Index of Teaching & Learning Strategy 0.22 (Individualized Instruction), this strategy is perfect to support the above idea that when teachers adapt instruction to the needs of students and aligning it to their capability, student achievement can occur.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide robust standards based professional development to our teachers and aides on how to meet the needs of our subgroup students.
2. Schedule collaborative planning times for grade levels in order to develop strong lessons and activities.

Person Responsible Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2020-2021 I-Ready AP3 data, in Kindergarten 50% of our students were considered to be on level, in 1st grade, 41% were on grade level, in 2nd grade 45% were on grade level, in 3rd grade 72% were on grade level, in 4th grade 50% were on grade level, and in 5th grade, only 35% were considered to be on grade level. Based on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA scores, 69% of our 3rd graders were a level 3 or higher, as compared to the District (44%) and the State (54%). For our 4th grade, 45% were a level 3 or higher, as compared to the District (42%) and the State (52%). For our 5th grade students, 53% were a level 3 or higher, as compared to the District (47%) and the State (54%).

Measurable Outcome: If we increase authentic literacy opportunities in grades Kindergarten through 5th grade through robust, standards based instruction, both whole group and in small groups, then we can increase student reading proficiency in all grade levels. In regards to I-Ready, we would like to see an increase in Kindergarten from 50% to 60%, in 1st grade from 41% to 51%, in 2nd grade an increase from 45% to 55%, in 3rd grade, an increase from 72% to 82%, for 4th grade, an increase from 50% to 60%, and in 5th grade, an increase from 35% to 50%. In regards to the ELA FSA, we would like to see an increase in students achieving a level 3 or higher in 3rd grade from 69% to 79%, in 4th grade from 45% to 55%, and in 5th grade an increase from 53% to 63%.

Monitoring: Student proficiency in all grade levels in ELA will be monitored weekly through weekly ELA assessments, as well as after each I-Ready monthly Growth Monitoring and I-Ready AP Diagnostic Assessment to address any needs or concerns. This will be achieved through assigned timelines, weekly walkthroughs, formal and informal observations, monitoring, and by providing constructive feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Administrative Team will provide ongoing professional development on authentic literacy opportunities based on Florida Standards. The Team will also ensure that all teachers are providing robust and targeted small group instruction aligned to address student reading deficits. These goals can be achieved by ensuring that academic instruction, both whole group and small group, is both rigorous and at grade level. According to Hattie Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents Professional development on student achievement 0.51 effect size, professional development is focused more on changes in teachers rather than impact on student outcomes. Also, according to Hattie Index 0.22, each student has unique interests and past learning experiences, and individualized programs take this into account. It also suggests that with student flexibility and individual differences, and when teachers adapt instruction to the needs of their students and aligns it to their capabilities, students growth is inevitable.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: First, through ongoing professional development, teachers will learn how to effectively implement instructional strategies that promote authentic reading opportunities. By providing new instructional strategies to our teachers our student's reading proficiency will increase. Lastly, by providing all of our students individual small group instruction, as well as robust remediation using individualized I-Ready ELA assignments, student scores will increase. I-Ready questions and scores are strongly correlated with the those of the FSA. This will be monitored through walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, as well as through constructive feedback.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development for teachers on literacy and instructional strategies, as well as provide collaboration opportunities weekly. This will be achieved through PD completion assignments, formal and informal observations.

Person Responsible Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will utilize I-Ready individualized student lessons and provide targeted student remediation in the area of reading. This will be monitored through weekly I-Ready individualized assignments, Growth Monitoring data, and AP Diagnostic Assessment data.

Person Responsible Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Paraprofessionals will also work closely with students and teachers to improve student achievement during class and during the MTSS blocks. This will be monitored through weekly walkthroughs, as well as informal and formal observations.

Person Responsible Michelle Axson (michelle.axson@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.

For the 2021-22 school year, we will be implementing the new District Cares School Community Curriculum, as well as, continuing to implement PBIS schoolwide in order to improve the discipline at our school.

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.

Marion Charter provides several opportunities throughout the school year in order for parents and families to volunteer. We hold annual Title I parent meetings, Open House, as well as Reading and Math FSA and Science FCAT presentations to the families of 3rd-5th graders. We also hold several afterschool carnivals in which the families participate and volunteer for, as well as requiring our parents to meet with their child's

teacher at least 3 times during the school year. In the 2019-2020 school year, we had 95% of our parents/grandparents attend the required parent conferences and 50 parents/grandparents who volunteered, representing about 60% of our school families. For the 2020-2021 school year, due to COVID restrictions, we were unable to hold meetings in person, but rather online, which caused our attendance numbers to drastically drop. For the 2021-2022 school year it is our goal to hold our meetings and Parent Nights both face to face and online, which should meet the comfort levels and schedule needs and preferences of all of our parents. Marion Charter tries to make helpful connections with the parents and guardians and encourages them to be actively involved. Strategies include making initial phone calls to invite parents/guardians out to meet with the teacher and counselor and following up with suggestions and materials to support the family. Marion Charter School uses Edline and Skyward as our parent connection tools. Parents can access their child's grades, assignments and support materials through the parent website. Parents are given an access code that they can activate to allow them access to grades and class information. Additionally, all forms from school, including field trip permission forms, class and school newsletters, calendars, etc are all found at the our website. It is a one stop place for all information about the school. Marion Charter also has a Parent Resource Room where parents/guardians are allowed to check out resources such as games, manipulatives, and workbooks, to use at home with their children. We are also starting our PTO back up this year as another way to get parents involved in their child's education.

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

The Administration works as a team with the school faculty, staff, parents and the community to create a climate and culture that is both positive and caring. The school will provide opportunities for parents, families, and other community stakeholders to participate in events that will build positive relationships and assist in fulfilling the school's mission and support the needs of students. The parents, families, and other community stakeholders will have opportunities to make suggestions and give feedback about the programs currently being utilized through yearly surveys.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00