Monroe County School District

# Marathon School



# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# **Marathon School**

## 350 SOMBRERO BEACH RD, Marathon, FL 33050

### [ no web address on file ]

**Demographics**

## **Principal: Wendelynn Mcpherson A**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>6-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | No |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 60% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>Students With Disabilities<br>White Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (57%)<br><br>2017-18: B (56%)<br><br>2016-17: B (54%)<br><br>2015-16: B (54%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [Diane Leinenbach](#) |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |
| * 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 Monroe 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.](www.floridacims.org.)

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

# Part I: School Information

## School Mission and Vision

### Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Marathon Middle/High School is to educate, empower, and enable all students to become responsible, caring, and contributing citizens.

### Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Marathon Middle/High School is to promote engaging and rigorous educational opportunities that create life-long learners and productive citizens in our community and society as a whole.

## School Leadership Team

### Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Gonzalez, Ryana | Teacher, ESE | The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Ryana Gonzalez is the ESE department chair. |
| Belotti, Christina | Teacher, K-12 | The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Christina Belotti is the ELA department chair. |
| Murphy, James | Teacher, K-12 | The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. James murphy is the Social Studies/History department chair. |
| Walker, Diana | Teacher, K-12 | The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Diana Walker is the middle school department chair. |
| Byrnes, Debra | Teacher, K-12 | The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Debra Byrnes is the mathematics department chair. |
| Stanton, Carl | Teacher, K-12 | The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| | | stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Carl Stanton is the elective department chair. |
| Collins, Gayzel | SAC Member | The School Advisory Council is responsible for final decision making at the school relating to the implementation of the provisions of the annual School Improvement Plan (SIP). The SAC assists in the annual preparation and evaluation of both the SIP and the school's annual budget. For further information, please see Section 1001.452(1)(a), Florida Statutes. Gayzel is the SAC Secretary. |
| McPherson, Wendy | Principal | |
| Rodriguez, Christina | Assistant Principal | To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist the building principal in the development and continuous implementation of a high school program which promotes the educational well-being of each student in the school. |
| Williams, Steven | SAC Member | The School Advisory Council is responsible for final decision making at the school relating to the implementation of the provisions of the annual School Improvement Plan (SIP). The SAC assists in the annual preparation and evaluation of both the SIP and the school's annual budget. For further information, please see Section 1001.452(1)(a), Florida Statutes. Steven is the SAC President. |
| Logan, Elizabeth | Assistant Principal | To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist the building principal in the development and continuous implementation of a high school program which promotes the educational well-being of each student in the school. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Wendelynn Mcpherson A

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
51

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | No |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 60% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (54%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Diane Leinenbach |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. | |

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 94 | 101 | 83 | 89 | 88 | 71 | 607 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 56 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 21 | 23 | 25 | 21 | 15 | 128 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 7 | 22 | 16 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 93 |

**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 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 16 | 17 | 14 | 7 | 88 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 24 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Thursday 10/15/2020

## Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 112 | 79 | 104 | 109 | 82 | 86 | 680 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 62 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 14 | 8 | 7 | 49 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 29 | 28 | 42 | 31 | 28 | 23 | 199 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 64 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

### Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 112 | 79 | 104 | 109 | 82 | 86 | 680 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 62 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 14 | 8 | 7 | 49 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 29 | 28 | 42 | 31 | 28 | 23 | 199 |

**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 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 64 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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**
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 | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 51% | 61% | 56% | 49% | 61% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 52% | 58% | 51% | 51% | 54% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 39% | 42% | 49% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 53% | 52% | 51% | 53% | 75% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | 53% | 58% | 48% | 54% | 67% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 51% | 45% | 39% | 67% | 45% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **School** | **District** | **State** | **School** | **District** | **State** |
| Science Achievement | 51% | 76% | 68% | 58% | 76% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 71% | 74% | 73% | 63% | 76% | 71% |

| **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey** | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicator** | **Grade Level (prior year reported)** | | | | | | | **Total** |
| | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**
**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 | 2019 | 45% | 57% | -12% | 54% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 56% | -20% | 52% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 42% | 58% | -16% | 52% | -10% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 56% | -8% | 51% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 45% | 60% | -15% | 56% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 64% | -18% | 58% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 09 | 2019 | 51% | 62% | -11% | 55% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 57% | -12% | 53% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 51% | 55% | -4% | 53% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 56% | 4% | 53% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 06 | 2019 | 53% | 53% | 0% | 55% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 55% | -14% | 52% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 56% | 61% | -5% | 54% | 2% |

### MATH

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2018 | 57% | 62% | -5% | 54% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 33% | 61% | -28% | 46% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 59% | -15% | 45% | -1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -24% | | | | |

### SCIENCE

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 08 | 2019 | 36% | 56% | -20% | 48% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 60% | -21% | 50% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

### BIOLOGY EOC

| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2019 | 61% | 72% | -11% | 67% | -6% |
| 2018 | 70% | 70% | 0% | 65% | 5% |
| Compare | | -9% | | | |

### CIVICS EOC

| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2019 | 62% | 80% | -18% | 71% | -9% |
| 2018 | 59% | 74% | -15% | 71% | -12% |
| Compare | | 3% | | | |

### HISTORY EOC

| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2019 | 71% | 74% | -3% | 70% | 1% |
| 2018 | 66% | 71% | -5% | 68% | -2% |
| Compare | | 5% | | | |

### ALGEBRA EOC

| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2019 | 45% | 70% | -25% | 61% | -16% |
| 2018 | 46% | 76% | -30% | 62% | -16% |
| Compare | | -1% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 56% | 69% | -13% | 57% | -1% |
| 2018 | 64% | 72% | -8% | 56% | 8% |
| Compare | | -8% | | | |

## Subgroup Data

| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 17 | 41 | 40 | 20 | 41 | 39 | 14 | 45 | | 64 | |
| ELL | 27 | 41 | 53 | 24 | 38 | 33 | 8 | 29 | | 69 | |
| BLK | 45 | 48 | 42 | 40 | 52 | | 31 | 50 | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 46 | 45 | 47 | 53 | 43 | 43 | 64 | 68 | 85 | 53 |
| WHT | 60 | 59 | 52 | 63 | 51 | 50 | 62 | 79 | 68 | 84 | 57 |
| FRL | 41 | 48 | 43 | 47 | 53 | 49 | 39 | 65 | 39 | 81 | 46 |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 15 | 43 | 44 | 23 | 29 | 19 | 27 | 23 | | | |
| ELL | 13 | 59 | 56 | 24 | 36 | 19 | 9 | | | 62 | |
| BLK | 39 | 57 | | 46 | 50 | 50 | | 65 | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 48 | 46 | 44 | 50 | 35 | 45 | 58 | 35 | 78 | 50 |
| WHT | 60 | 53 | 48 | 65 | 58 | 47 | 71 | 69 | 71 | 89 | 63 |
| FRL | 43 | 49 | 48 | 49 | 53 | 38 | 51 | 61 | 44 | 74 | 38 |

## ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 675 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 12 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 |
| 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 | 38 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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 | 44 |
| 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 |

| 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 |

| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 51 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

ELA learning gains of lowest 25% decreased by 3 percentage points and learning gains in mathematics decreased 7 percentage points. The trends of the ELA lowest 25% learning gains is up and down within the last two years. The learning gains in mathematics indicates a steady downward trend.

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

ELA learning gains lowest 25% decreased by 3 percentage points and science achievement decreased 7 percentage points.

**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**

The greatest gap between school and state data was science achievement at 51%. The state achievement was 68%. The gap represents a 17% decrease. Staffing shifts may explain gaps.

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

Both mathematics lowest 25% and social studies achievement showed an 8 percentage point increase. MHS will continue to implement an after school tutoring program and best practices in both areas.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators in eighth and ninth grade is an area of concern.

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

1. Subgroup performance of ELLs and SWDs
2. High School acceleration
3. Science achievement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | SWD student federal index was 36% which is below the federal index of 41 percent. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | During the 2020-2021 school year Marathon High School will increase the federal index scores for the SWD subgroup from 36 percent to 42 percent. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Wendy McPherson (wendy.mcpherson@keysschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Marathon High School will utilize targeted Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) strategies. Each department will choose two (2) specific AVID strategies to use across the department. Common strategies identified include anchor charts, sentence stems/paragraph frames, and graphic organizers. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) approach builds common language for learning, sets high expectations for teachers and students, and increases collaboration in all classrooms. The common strategies promote scaffolding for learning as well as language acquisition. |

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Faculty/department training on commonly identified AVID strategies
2. Develop implementation schedule and expectations school wide
3. Departments determine additional training needs
4. Monitor through horizontal and vertical teams

**Person Responsible** Elizabeth Logan (elizabeth.logan@keysschools.com)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Marathon High School ELA Lowest 25th Percentile decreased 3% from the previous year. The SWD and ELL groups also decreased 4% and 3% respectively in this area. Increased efforts targeting the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile will improve ESSA subgroups that were below the federal index and decrease other achievement gaps in ELA. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | During the 2020-2021 school year, Marathon High School will increase ELA Lowest 25th Percentile performance from 46% to 49%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Wendy McPherson (wendy.mcpherson@keysschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Marathon High School will utilize targeted Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) strategies. Each department will choose two (2) specific AVID strategies to use across the department. Common strategies identified include anchor charts, sentence stems/paragraph frames, and graphic organizers.

The Marathon High School English department staff will use ELA pacing guides to ensure standards and benchmarks are taught within each grade level. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) approach builds common language for learning, sets high expectations for teachers and students, and increases collaboration in all classrooms. The common strategies promote scaffolding for learning as well as language acquisition.

According the ASCD, the best pacing guides emphasize curriculum guidance instead of prescriptive pacing; these guides focus on central ideas and provide links to exemplary curriculum materials, lessons, and instructional strategies. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Faculty/department training on commonly identified AVID strategies
2. Develop implementation schedule and expectations school-wide
3. Departments determine additional training needs
4. Monitor through horizontal and vertical teams
5. Monitor through lesson plan check and learning walks

**Person Responsible**  Elizabeth Logan (elizabeth.logan@keysschools.com)

1. Department training on ELA resources and pacing guide
2. Develop master meeting schedule to give time for departments to meet and address curricular foci
3. Attend ELA meetings
4. Monitor lesson plans

**Person Responsible**  Christina Rodriguez (christina.rodriguez@keysschools.com)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**1. Social Emotional Learning is a priority at Marathon High School. MHS will implement the Covitality (COVI) universal screener to identify students in need of assistance. Purpose Prep, the district approved SEL curriculum, is being taught consistently across the campus. MHS has also implemented a PBIS plan to recognize and support positive actions by both students and staff.**
**2. School safety is a priority. Marathon High School will use the ERIP platform to identify and monitor school safety priorities. The MHS staff will complete the required safety training on the ERIP platform. AlerT will be implemented for active assailant training. Twice monthly safety drills will be monitored through the ERIP platform**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Marathon High School builds a positive school culture and environment in several ways. First, MHS is a PBIS school. The PBIS plan addresses both students and staff. The PBIS committee is currently involving the community in several ways. The school advisory council (SAC) is one stakeholder group that includes staff, parent, student, and community input. A variety of community driven topics are addressed in SAC meetings. MHS currently works with two booster programs. Both programs bring several community members, parents, and teachers together united in a common cause. MHS has several communication methods used to send and receive vital information: Facebook, school website, Blackboard Connect phone calls, marquee, and FOCUS Parent Portal. MHS also promotes a college ready atmosphere throughout the campus via banners, pennants, and high expectations.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

## Part V: Budget

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | $0.00 |
|---|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------|

| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 0131 - Marathon School | | | $0.00 |
| **2** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA** | | | | **$0.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | | 0131 - Marathon School | | | $0.00 |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$0.00** |