Marion Charter School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Marion Charter School

39 CEDAR RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Axson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2013

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)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

N/A

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.](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

Marion Charter School

39 CEDAR RD, Ocala, FL 34472

[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	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	60%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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
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
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 6/10/2013, Michelle Axson

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.*
13

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

13

Total number of students enrolled at the school

228

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

1

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

1

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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	51	36	37	34	33	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217
Attendance below 90 percent	17	10	2	4	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	20	3	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	4	12	10	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	6	9	5	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	5	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	6	12	12	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	52%	46%	56%				59%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						65%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						42%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	50%	50%				70%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	66%						60%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						53%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	53%	59%				56%	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	59%	44%	15%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	59%	45%	14%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

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	73%	49%	24%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	70%	45%	25%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	57%	44%	13%	53%	4%
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
SWD	38			38							
BLK	42	47		58	47						
HSP	45	60		50	60						
WHT	65	47		68	79						
FRL	39	49	64	57	56	36	33				
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				

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	54
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
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	48
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?

Last year, our scores in 3rd, 4th, and 5th in both reading and math, showed growth in all academic areas. For the 2021-22 school year, for ELA, our 3rd graders surpassed both the county and the state with 59% proficiency as opposed to the County (42%) and the State (53%). Our 4th grade students were comparable with the County with 45% proficiency, as to the County (50%). Our 4th grade proficiency level was below the State's (57%). Our 5th grade students surpassed the County with 50% proficiency compared to the County (43%). Our 5th grade students were slightly below the State's 55% proficiency score.

For Math, our 3rd graders again greatly surpassed the county and the state with 68% proficiency, as compared to the County (49%) and the State (58%). For 4th grade, 55% of our students were proficient, which was comparable to the County (58%), and was below the State (61%). Our 5th graders surpassed both the county and state averages, with 69% proficiency compared to the County (46%) and the State (52%).

For Science, our 5th grade students surpassed the County with 46% proficiency, as compared to the County (38%) and slightly below the State's average (48%).

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

Based on our progress monitoring data, our 4th grade sores in reading continued to drop throughout the 2021-22 school year from 59% to 52%. When comparing the QSMA data to our 3 year trend in FSA, our reading scores dropped from 35% to 20% causing a need for improvement. We will make reading in 4th grade our major focus this year as well as continuing to focus on math. Also, Even though we showed growth in Science this year based on the NGSS State test, we will continue to focus on Science as well for the 2022-23 school year.

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 reading and Science curriculum. Last year, our 4th grade teacher was inexperienced with teaching the standards effectively. She would benefit from extra support and professional development, as well as a mentor. We have also invested in new state aligned curriculum in reading, math, and science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 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. We will continue this practice for the 2022-23 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?

Last year, we implemented the new MyView Reading Curriculum, and for the 2022-23 school year, we have purchased the new Envision Math curriculum, while closely following the state B.E.S.T. 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 2022-23 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, how to effectively teach using the B.E.S.T. standards, and how to effectively utilize our Reading, Math, and Science adopted curriculum. 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.

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 Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	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: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Through implementation of effective and rigorous standards based instruction in Science, the student learning gains and proficiencies will increase by at least 30% going from 23% to 53%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	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: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will use collaborative planning using the B.E.S.T. 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: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Last year, 46% of our 5th Grade students were considered perficient, as opposed to 23% the previous year. 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

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.

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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	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: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	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:	Valerie Wells (valerie.wells@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	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. We would like to offer several "hands on" Parent Make and Take Game Night opportunities to our parents this year to help their child(ren) be successful with their reading and math skills. We will offer simple dinners and child care in order to intice our parent's to attend, as well as provide all materials for families to make games to use at home.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Based on the parent surveys, 96% of our 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. Because of this result, we will be offering Reading and Math Make and Take Nights this year. The make and take resources are packets that we will be putting together using materials from the County's Parent Resource bus, as well as resources from Just Read Florida!

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.

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   Valerie Wells (valerie.wells@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Past QSMA data reflects a need for support for our Multiple Subgroups in order to meet their academic needs. For 3rd grade ELA, ED had a proficiency rate of 57% compared to non ED students (68%), 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 had a proficiency of 56% compared to non SWD (69%). For 5th grade ELA, ED had a proficiency rate of 60% compared to non ED (69%), LEP had a proficiency rate of 69% compared to non LEPs(64%), and SWD had a proficiency rate of 46% compared to non SWD (69%). For 3rd grade Math, ED had a proficiency rate of 63% compared to non ED students (74%), 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 had a proficiency of 43% compared to non SWD (43%). For 5th grade Math, the ED had a proficiency rate of 52% compared to non ED (58%), the LEP had a proficiency rate of 56% compared to non LEPs(55%), and SWD had a proficiency rate of 54% compared to non SWD (55%). For 5th grade Science, the ED had a proficiency rate of 37% compared to non ED (48%). The SWD had a proficiency rate of 37% compared to non SWD (45%).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	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.

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this 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 align it to their capability, student achievement can occur.

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.

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   Valerie Wells (valerie.wells@marion.k12.fl.us)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the 2021-2022 I-Ready Reading Diagnostic results, 47% of our Kindergarteners were above grade level, 25% were on grade level, and 27% were 1 grade level below. For our 1st graders, 42% were considered to be above grade level, 14% on grade level, 39% 1 grade level below, and 6% 2 or more grade levels below. For our 2nd graders, 24% were considered to be above grade level, 16% were on grade level, 57% were 1 grade level below, and 3% were considered 2 or more grade levels below.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the 2021-22 ELA State Assessment, 41% of our 3rd graders scored below a Level 3, 55% of our 4th graders scored below a Level 3, and 50% of our 5th graders scored below a Level 3.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

If we increase authentic literacy opportunities in grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade through robust, standards based instruction, both whole group and in small groups, then we can increase student reading proficiency in each of these 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%, and in 2nd grade an increase from 45% to 55%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

If we increase authentic literacy opportunities in grades 3rd 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 3rd grade 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 59% to 79%, in 4th grade from 45% to 55%, and in 5th grade an increase from 50% to 60%.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

All ELA Areas of Focus will be monitored on a weekly basis using classroom reading benchmark data, and after each FAST State Assessment, District Progress Monitoring Assessment (DMPA), and IReady AP assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Axson, Michelle, michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We are continuing to implement the evidence based Savvas MyView reading curriculum that is aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards, as well as aligning with the District's Reading Plan. We will also continue to provide all of our Tier II and Tier III students with research and evidence based supplemental curriculum in order to close the learning gaps in reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

We would like to continue to strengthen our foundational skills in reading across all grade levels. By using the state adopted curriculum, our evidence based supplemental curriculum, and by providing our staff with robust professional development throughout the year, our students proficiency will increase.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
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 increases. 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 new FAST state test. This will be monitored through walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, as well as through constructive feedback.	Axson, Michelle, michelle.axson@marion.k12.fl.us
We will offer free after-school tutoring to all of our Tier II and Tier III students. By offering after school tutoring in reading, our students will receive robust, yet fun, review lessons based on their individual reading needs. Monitoring will be done through after school walk-throughs, review of tutoring data, as well as review of their classroom data.	Axson, Michelle, michelle.axson@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.

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 BEST and Science NGSS 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 2021-2022 school year, we had 96% of our parents/grandparents attend the required parent conferences and 50 parents/grandparents who volunteered,

representing about 60% of our school families. For the 2022-2023 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 DOJO, Facebook, Skyward, and our school website 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 atthe 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 school culture and environment.

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.