

Marion County Public Schools

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts

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

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

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

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Upon receiving all school assessment data for the previous school year and access to School Improvement Planning for the following school year has opened, the school leadership team meets to disaggregate the data to assess strengths, weaknesses, and then develop an action plan. Upon teachers return to school and during the pre-planning week, department heads from each grade level and department, meet to assess the data and action planning for the year. This information is then brought to the School Advisory Council for their review.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The action plan, measurable outcomes, and monitoring elements are assessed monthly and quarterly throughout the year to ensure appropriate progress. If during these points throughout the year a lack of progress toward the measurable goal is recognized an assessment of the lack of progress and a specific plan to address will be implemented with the administrative team, appropriate instructional personnel, and students

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	62%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	6	3	7	7	5	10	0	0	0	38	
One or more suspensions	3	0	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	2	7	2	0	3	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	4	3	2	3	0	0	0	14

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	6	3	7	7	5	10	0	0	0	38	
One or more suspensions	3	0	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	1	2	7	2	0	3	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	4	3	2	3	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	6	3	7	7	5	10	0	0	0	38	
One or more suspensions	3	0	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	1	2	7	2	0	3	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	4	3	2	3	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	76			86	47	56	83		
ELA Learning Gains				76	56	61	80		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58	51	52	80		
Math Achievement*	78			89	54	60	83		
Math Learning Gains				82	62	64	68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72	52	55	60		
Science Achievement*	76			77	42	51	77		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	313
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	540
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	66			
HSP	88			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	69			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	66			
HSP	90			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	89			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	65			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	76			78			76					
SWD	47			47							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	67			61			64				4	
HSP	81			83			88				4	
MUL	75			80							2	
PAC												
WHT	76			80			74				4	
FRL	61			66			77				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	86	76	58	89	82	72	77					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	80	55	53	78	81	71	47					
HSP	88	85		91	95							
MUL	96	94		88	78		90					
PAC												
WHT	85	75	63	92	79	80	89					
FRL	80	62	50	75	71	63	53					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	83	80	80	83	68	60	77					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	72	86		76	73		59					
HSP	88	83		88	75		69					
MUL	91			91								
PAC												
WHT	83	78		82	70	55	80					
FRL	71	90		79	64		65					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	49%	33%	54%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	48%	27%	58%	17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	84%	39%	45%	50%	34%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	48%	33%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	53%	19%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	85%	50%	35%	55%	30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	43%	32%	51%	24%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Fourth Grade Math Proficiency was the lowest performing student assessment data component. A contributing factor was a need for additional support and professional learning for new teachers.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Fourth Grade Math proficiency was also the data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year. A contributing factor was a need for additional support and professional learning for new teachers.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Third Grade ELA Proficiency was 33% (83%) above the state average of 50%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

There was no data component that showed improvement between FSA (SY 21-22) and F.A.S.T. (SY 22-23).

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Based on a review of Early Warning System Data from the 2022-2023 school year, 38 students were chronically absent (10% or greater). This is a potential area of concern.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. 4th Grade Math Proficiency
2. 5th Grade Math Proficiency

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A review of FAST data from SY 22-23 revealed a decline of 4th Grade Math proficiency from 81% to 72%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With a specific focus on 4th Grade Math proficiency, we plan to achieve at least a proficiency level of 81% on the 4th grade Math FAST PM3 Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through the 4th Grade Math PM1 and PM2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Utilizing enVision math Tier I as well as enVision math diagnostic and intervention system (MDIS) during small group differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

enVision math is the district adopted Tier I and intervention resource aligned with the Florida BEST Benchmarks .

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Create an active and sustained process to recruit high-quality teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Identify a pool of three areas from which to recruit high quality teachers. These areas will include a local (Marion County) area, state-wide colleges of education, and national (Employment Website) searches.

Monitoring:

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

The principal will identify the areas from which to identify potential candidates and list future and potential openings throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the amount of applicants (6) for two open positions, as compared to past years (over 12), identifying alternate sources/pools of applicants will be essential.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus