

Marion County Public Schools

# North Marion Middle School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# North Marion Middle School

2085 W HIGHWAY 329, Citra, FL 32113

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: James Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (41%)<br>2018-19: C (50%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TSI   |

\* 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## North Marion Middle School

2085 W HIGHWAY 329, Citra, FL 32113

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 59%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       |         | C       | C       |

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

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

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

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

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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   |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Johnson, James   | Principal           | The Principal is the instructional leader of the school. Their job duties include, but are not limited to accountability, public relations, budgets, evaluations, SAC, facilities, crisis management, Title 1, business partners, scheduling, and professional development.   |
| Gamoneda, Sheila | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal of Curriculum's main role is to oversee the areas of curriculum and instruction. Some of their job duties and responsibilities include Tier Talks/PMP meetings, PST meetings, MTSS, testing coordinator, Skyward gradebook, textbooks and curriculum materials, report cards and progress reports, professional development, and evaluations. |
| Jones, Cynthia   | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal of Discipline oversees the areas of discipline and behavior, and oversees the following: fire and ALICE drills, school safety, Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS), behavior MTSS, Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT), and PST meetings for behavior.   |
| Tucker, Tamara   | Dean                | The Dean works the areas of discipline and behavior, supports teachers with classroom management needs, and assists the APD with the following: fire and ALICE drills, school safety, Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS), behavior MTSS, and PST meetings for behavior.   |
| Spangler, Scott  | Dean                | The Dean works the areas of discipline and behavior, supports teachers with classroom management needs, and assists the APD with the following: fire and ALICE drills, school safety, Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS), behavior MTSS, and PST meetings for behavior.   |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 7/1/2022, James Johnson

**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.*

1

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

44

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

826

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

14

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

16

**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                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 237 | 271 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 752   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96  | 82  | 112 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 290   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96  | 107 | 91  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 294   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65  | 92  | 62  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 219   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39  | 82  | 85  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 206   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97  | 97  | 81  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 275   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 103 | 110 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 315   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 111 | 113 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 302   |

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           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| 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

Monday 8/22/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 270 | 231 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 742   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87  | 95  | 91  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 273   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91  | 73  | 57  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 221   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 136 | 83  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 327   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 111 | 105 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 327   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67  | 77  | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 200   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80  | 87  | 60  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 227   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**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             | 36%    | 42%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 43%    | 49%      | 54%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 40%    | 41%      | 48%   |        |          |       | 51%    | 54%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 33%    | 31%      | 38%   |        |          |       | 43%    | 46%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            | 35%    | 46%      | 54%   |        |          |       | 49%    | 54%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 39%    | 49%      | 58%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 58%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 41%    | 43%      | 55%   |        |          |       | 45%    | 50%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 30%    | 40%      | 49%   |        |          |       | 34%    | 46%      | 51%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 52%    | 65%      | 71%   |        |          |       | 65%    | 70%      | 72%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 39%    | 45%      | -6%                        | 54%   | -15%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 40%    | 46%      | -6%                        | 52%   | -12%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -39%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 48%    | 50%      | -2%                        | 56%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -40%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 44%    | 46%      | -2%                        | 55%   | -11%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 35%    | 49%      | -14%                       | 54%   | -19%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -44%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 41%      | 13%                        | 46%   | 8%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -35%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 35%    | 44%      | -9%                        | 48%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 62%    | 65%      | -3%                   | 71%   | -9%                |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 96%    | 54%      | 42%                   | 61%   | 35%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 100%   | 51%      | 49%                   | 57%   | 43%                |

### 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                                       | 10       | 30     | 29          | 10        | 27      | 34           | 18       | 19      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 34       | 34     | 15          | 35        | 33      | 15           | 18       | 44      | 62        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 19       | 33     | 30          | 19        | 34      | 40           | 12       | 34      | 48        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 41       | 44     | 28          | 40        | 42      | 38           | 26       | 57      | 58        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 50       | 43     |             | 46        | 48      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 44       | 43     | 38          | 43        | 41      | 43           | 43       | 61      | 67        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 30       | 37     | 34          | 28        | 36      | 40           | 25       | 42      | 52        |                   |                     |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 7        | 26     | 27          | 7         | 23      | 31           | 3        | 12      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 27       | 48     | 38          | 24        | 34      | 33           | 14       | 31      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 16       | 28     | 25          | 17        | 22      | 25           | 9        | 21      | 35        |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| HSP                                       | 42       | 50     | 41          | 38        | 39      | 44           | 27       | 48      | 62        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 50       | 74     |             | 50        | 40      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 44       | 43     | 31          | 46        | 40      | 31           | 39       | 57      | 71        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 27       | 36     | 28          | 27        | 31      | 30           | 20       | 38      | 55        |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 10       | 32     | 26          | 19        | 45      | 30           | 9        | 27      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 12       | 47     | 64          | 29        | 48      | 43           |          | 61      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 24       | 43     | 38          | 29        | 51      | 41           | 18       | 49      | 38        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 38       | 55     | 50          | 50        | 57      | 54           | 30       | 69      | 70        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 61       | 54     |             | 72        | 68      |              | 55       | 70      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 57       | 55     | 46          | 61        | 57      | 42           | 46       | 74      | 68        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 40       | 50     | 40          | 46        | 54      | 43           | 30       | 64      | 63        |                   |                     |

### 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)  | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 41  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 4   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 46  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 414 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 22  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 3   |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 34  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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                                | 30  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 42  |
| 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   | 47  |
| 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   | 47  |
| 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                                | 37  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| 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?

When analyzing state assessment data, science achievement has consistently been the furthest below the district and state average. ELA and Math proficiency also have consistently been below the district average. Our SWD and African American subgroups are our two subgroups that require the most support.

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

Based on 2022 state assessments, science achievement (30% proficient) as well as ELA (36% proficient) and Math proficiency (35% proficient) are the areas that are furthest behind district/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?

We found that In both ELA and math, student practice tasks were not consistently aligned with the instructional level of rigor and complexity to meet the demands of the subject matter standards. Therefore we will begin to intentionally provide students with appropriately rigorous tasks with scaffolded instruction, and that will improve overall math and ELA achievement by at least 4% points in each area.

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

In looking at 2022 state assessment data, the areas that improved the most over the prior year's data were Math learning gains for the lowest 25% and Civics Achievement. These areas improved by 9% and 8%, respectively.

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

In Civics, the teachers embraced the collaborative planning model by meeting with the Assistant Principal regularly as part of a focused Professional Learning Community that really "unpacked" the curriculum and designed appropriate lessons together. We will continue with this process this year, and hopefully evolve the process to also include best practices for instructional delivery. We will also replicate this same intentional process with other subject area teams.

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

School-wide subject-area collaborative planning focused on improving Tier 1 instruction will continue to be improved upon in ALL subjects, in order to make it more useful for the teachers. Tier 1 lessons will be structured in a gradual release model with student learning activities aligned to the depth of the standard in rigor and complexity. The hope is that this process can help to create greater collective teacher efficacy, which is a very high effect strategy according to Hattie (1.57 effect size).

**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.**

Professional development will be offered during collaborative planning as teachers develop skillsets with strategies to deliver quality Tier 1 instruction. They will examine common assessments and use that data to drive their next steps. Professional development will also be offered during collaborative planning for strategies to accelerate learning in math through student practice aligned to the depth and rigor of the grade-level standard.

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

This year, with the adoption of the "7 period day," we are able to schedule our level 1 and 2 students into an elective class that will help them to develop the specific skills that it takes to be successful in other subject-area classes.

### **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.**

ELA and Math proficiency has seen a sharp decline since 2019. Since 2019, ELA proficiency has dropped from 43% in 2019 to 36% in 2022, and in Math from 49% in 2019 to 35% in 2022. Since there will be no learning gains for the 2023 school year, improving proficiency has to be the focus.

**Measurable Outcome:  
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

If teachers plan collaboratively to develop quality/appropriate instructional tasks, and use the data generated from these tasks to guide future instruction, then proficiency in both ELA will increase from 36% to 41% and Math will increase from 35% to 41%.

**Monitoring:  
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. We will also monitor the effectiveness of implementation using classroom walkthrough observational data and other assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Teachers will be provided with professional development in instructional task selection and purposeful ongoing formative assessment. We will follow up on these professional learning opportunities by conducting focused formative walkthroughs with the leadership team to gauge the implementation of these practices. According to John Hattie's research, in his Index of Teaching, teacher use of formative evaluations has a .90 effect size and the highest effects are seen when teachers seek evidence on where exactly students aren't doing well.

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

Through evidence collected in doing classroom walkthroughs, it was found that Tier 1 instruction is inconsistent among teachers at NMMS across subject areas. Therefore, in addition to continuing to improve our collaborative planning process, we are focusing on improving teachers' Tier 1 instruction across all subjects and grade levels. Specifically, we will focus on student engagement through discourse, providing students with quality feedback, and implementation of purposeful formative assessment to drive future instruction.

**selecting 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.

Support teachers with Tier 1 goals during weekly collaborative planning meetings. During these meetings, coaches/administrators and teachers will work together to develop the pacing and sequencing of the standards taught each week. The teachers will be provided with a number of vetted, standards-aligned, resources to use to plan each week's learning activities. Coach and Administrators will also support the teachers in purposeful planning of embedded formative assessments to systematically monitor the entire classes' level of mastery of each lesson. This collected data will also be discussed and compared between teachers in like-classes each week at collaborative planning meetings to help guide future instruction.

**Person Responsible**

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

**#2. 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.**

In reviewing data from past school years, Science achievement data has consistently scored as the lowest area at North Marion Middle school. The highest that Science achievement has been in the last 5 years was 2019 (34%), with 2021 being the lowest (27%). Our latest data in Science, from 2022, showed that only 30% of our students were proficient in Science.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

If teachers use data from intentionally planned common subject-area assessments to plan for instruction, with a focus on the specific test item specifications, then Science proficiency will increase by 5%, from 30% to 35%.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. We will also monitor the effectiveness of implementation using classroom walkthrough observational data and other assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Teachers will be provided with professional development in delivery of quality tier 1 instruction, test-item specifications review, and purposeful ongoing formative assessment. We will follow up on these professional learning opportunities by conducting focused formative walkthroughs with the leadership team to gauge the implementation of these practices.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Through evidence collected in doing classroom walkthroughs, it was found that Tier 1 instruction is inconsistent among subject areas. Therefore, in addition to continuing to improve our collaborative planning process, we are focusing on improving teachers' Tier 1 instruction across all subjects and grade levels. Specifically, we will focus on delivery of quality tier 1 instruction, test-item specifications review, and purposeful ongoing formative assessment to drive future instruction.

**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.

Support teachers with Tier 1 goals during Science collaborative meetings. During these twice-monthly collaborative meetings, coaches/administrators and teachers will work together to develop the pacing and

sequencing of the standards taught each week. The teachers will be provided with a number of vetted, standards-aligned, resources to use to plan each week's learning activities. Coach will also support the teachers in purposeful planning of embedded formative assessments to systematically monitor the entire classes' level of mastery of each lesson. This collected data will also be discussed and compared between teachers in each particular subject-area each time at collaborative planning meetings to help guide future instruction.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@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.**

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers, and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
- Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment, we will offer different modalities (online and paper-based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee. Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys, and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

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

The key stakeholders with a role in promoting a positive school culture and environment at the school include the Principal and Leadership Team, the teachers and staff, the parents, and the students. Each one of these groups plays a key role in promoting that positive culture. The Principal and Leadership Team are responsible for creating a culture where positivity is valued, and negativity is not given a chance to grow. They can do this by leading by example. The teachers and staff can also promote that positive culture by ensuring that the culture in their particular classroom or area is positive in nature. It stands to reason that if all of the "mini-cultures" in the school are positive, then the overall culture will be positive as well. Next, the

parents can contribute to the overall environment by supporting the personnel at school as they build a positive environment. Finally, the students contribute by following all school expectations and also being good influences on their peers.