Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts

401 NW MARTIN LUTHER KING JR AVE, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: John Kerley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (77%) 2018-19: A (87%) 2017-18: A (84%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts

401 NW MARTIN LUTHER KING JR AVE, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The faculty, staff, parents, and business partners of Madison Street Academy of Visual and Performing Arts work together to provide a quality learning environment that ensures success through the integration of the arts, academics, and technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Madison Street Academy is committed to providing a quality learning environment that ensures success through the integration of the arts, academics, and technology.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kerley, John	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The employee in this position supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school and reports to the assigned administrator.
Smith, Mitzi	Assistant Principal	To aid the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Wallace, Elizabeth	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. Reports to Principal and/or Assistant Principal and supervises assigned support staff.
Stoddard, Angela	School Counselor	To coordinate a Comprehensive School Counseling Program for all students leading to academic success, career awareness, social/personal development, community involvement and multicultural/global citizenship development.
Miller, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as a full-time professional developer in the areas of math, science, and literacy utilizing effective professional development practices to build capacity of classroom teachers and paraprofessionals to support student learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, John Kerley

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

457

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

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	3	7	7	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	3	0	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	1	2	7	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	4	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 7/13/2022

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	69	71	70	74	77	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	11	16	17	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	1	6	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

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	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	69	71	70	74	77	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	11	16	17	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	1	6	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

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	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	86%	47%	56%				94%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	76%	56%	61%				83%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	51%	52%				88%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	89%	54%	60%				91%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	82%	62%	64%				85%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	52%	55%				78%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	42%	51%				93%	47%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	93%	44%	49%	58%	35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	92%	49%	43%	58%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				
05	2022					
	2019	96%	45%	51%	56%	40%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	87%	49%	38%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	93%	54%	39%	64%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2022					
	2019	93%	45%	48%	60%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	93%	44%	49%	53%	40%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
BLK	80	55	53	78	81	71	47				
HSP	88	85		91	95						
MUL	96	94		88	78		90				
WHT	85	75	63	92	79	80	89				
FRL	80	62	50	75	71	63	53				

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
BLK	72	86		76	73		59				
HSP	88	83		88	75		69				
MUL	91			91							
WHT	83	78		82	70	55	80				
FRL	71	90		79	64		65				

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	77			85							
ASN	91			100							
BLK	84	83	88	76	71	70	78				
HSP	100	94		96	89						
MUL	100			100							
WHT	96	81	89	94	88	87	96				
FRL	87	83	79	87	81	75	81				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	540
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	90
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	89
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	80
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	65
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 a review of 2022 FSA data, there was a increase in the percent proficient for ELA and Math in each assessed grade level (3-5). ELA proficiency was 90% in 2019, 83% in 2021 and 86% in 2021. Math proficiency was 91% in 2019, 83% in 2021, and 89% in 2022.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

As ELA and Math proficiency increased in every grade level over the previous year, learning gains in 4th grade, specifically of the lowest 25% in ELA, is an area indicating the greatest need for improvement. Additionally, Science proficiency did not show an increase between 2021 and 2022 assessments. MSAs current proficiency rate of 77% is 40% higher than the district average and 30% higher than the state average.

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

One possible contributing factor was the addition of a writing component to the overall ELA score in 4th grade This added component can be an adjustment for these students being assessed in this area for the first time.
Two specific actions were put in place for the 22-23 school year do address this need. First, an MTSS block was put in place to specifically address students performing at the bottom 25% of the grade level. Second, a team (one instructor teaching reading and one for math) was created in the grade level to focus the reading instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Progress monitoring data throughout the 21-22 school year indicated a predicted proficiency between 59%-74% on the FSA in both Reading and Math. Actual FSA proficiency out performed predictions by a minimum of 20% and a maximum of 33% in both Reading and Math.

ELA and Math in each assessed grade level (3-5). ELA proficiency was 90% in 2019, 83% in 2021 and 86% in 2021. Math proficiency was 91% in 2019, 83% in 2021, and 89% in 2022.

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

A specific focus on standards-aligned instruction across grade levels and subject areas. Classroom observations as well as data tracking, utilizing progress monitoring data throughout assessment periods. Additionally, growth monitoring data for targeted students will also track individual student growth. Additionally coach and administrators will model and monitor implementation. Progress monitoring data will be evaluated on an ongoing basis.

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

Collaboratively planned, standards-based direct instruction as well as classroom observations.

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.

In addition to weekly collaborative planning sessions, specific professional learning on 'designing coherent instruction' and 'content-specific critical reading' will be provided.

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

The addition of an Intervention Teacher/Coach will model effective planning and lessons with teachers based on need and evidence. Evidence will be determined through classroom observations as well as data tracking, utilizing progress monitoring data in the assessment periods. Assessment period data will also provide evidence of progress.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	As ELA and Math proficiency increased in every grade level over the previous year, learning gains in 4th grade, specifically of the lowest 25% in ELA, emerged an area indicating the greatest need for improvement. Due to this, enrichment time was built into the daily instructional for every classroom. The focus of this time will be to isolate areas of need and remediate them. As this will benefit all students, it will specifically target and provide intervention to the students in most need of targeted intervention (Lowest 25%).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency rate in 4th grade ELA will increase by 5%. Additionally, learning gains of the lowest 25% in 4th grade ELA will increase by a least 30%. Note: This year being a baseline year for F.A.S.T. will require a correlation to determine the % proficient as well as learning gains.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Using state and district progress monitoring assessments as well as classroom observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Kerley (john.kerley@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Standards-based direct instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Collaboratively planned, standards-based direct instruction can eliminate misinterpretations and greatly improve learning. Progress monitoring and FSA scores as well as classroom observations were used to select this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Develop a shared definition of instruction, learning, tasks, and intellectual thinking. Using the district adopted instructional framework
Utilizing these definitions, share specific examples of these and what they would look like in the classroom.
Observed examples will be brought and shared to other instructional staff either through classroom visits, models, and/or collaboration meetings. Utilize these definitions in collaborative planning to design learning tasks.

Person Responsible   John Kerley (john.kerley@marion.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Madison Street Academy employs a 'Culture of Service' to build a positive school culture and environment. The specifics of a Culture of Service are for each stakeholder within the school to ensure that those that they serve are equipped with all the tools, both tangible and intangible, as well as ensuring a safe and secure environment for them to preform their duties within their job responsibility in the most effective and efficient manner. For example, it is my job as the principal to provide to my administrative team a safe and secure work environment as well as all the tools they need to perform their duties. When these needs are met, each individual within this group is able to then provide the same to those that they serve. This pattern continues throughout the entire school's faculty and staff. This process ensures an ownership of each role within the school and autonomy to problem solve and troubleshoot potential issues or concerns. Ultimately, a 'Culture of Service' naturally builds a positive school culture and environment.

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

The principal provides leadership and direction for all aspects of the school's operation. Specific to promoting a positive culture and environment at the school, he will exercise proactive leadership in promoting a culture of service as well as the vision and mission of the school while providing recognition and celebration for student, staff, and school accomplishments. The assistant principal, dean, school counselor, intervention teacher, school secretary, receptionist, as well as all other faculty and staff assist the principal in these duties towards a culture of service.