

Monroe County School District

Marathon School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

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 (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 Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: B 2015-16: B 2014-15: B 2013-14: B
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

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.

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 and position title 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.
Bish, 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 stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Carl Bish is the science department chair.
Paul, Christine	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.
Logan, Liz	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.
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.
	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. Christina is the SAC Chair.
Mandile, Lori	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. Lori is the SAC Vice-chair
McPherson, Wendy	Principal	

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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

53

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	10	13	11	10	15	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	21	27	24	19	6	121
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	5	3	3	22
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	7	11	17	22	16	14	9	96

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

NOTE: 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
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%
	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	
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? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

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	
Title	High School Acceleration
Rationale	Marathon High School students will be better prepared for college and/or career opportunities upon graduation
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-2020 school year, Marathon High School will increase Career and College Acceleration from 53% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Wendy McPherson (wendy.mcpherson@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increase opportunities for industry certifications, Advanced Placement, and Dual Enrollment through intentional scheduling.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students who are exposed to higher levels courses and industry certification courses are more likely to graduate with the necessary skills for success.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Counselors and administrators will monitor students in each cohort. 2. Students will be surveyed to determine interests of students and match to industry certification or AP/DE courses. 3. Counselors will meet with each student to schedule students into appropriate acceleration courses. 4. Increase certification course and AP/DE courses identified through student interest and community needs. 5. Implement boot camps, lunch tutoring, and after school tutoring to meet student needs to pass courses or industry exams.
Person Responsible	Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)

#2

Title ELL and SWD Subgroup Performance
Rationale ELL and SWD students scored below the federal index of 41 percent. The federal index was 38 percent for ELL students and 36 percent for SWD students.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve During the 2019-2020 school year Marathon High School will increase the federal index scores for the ELL subgroup from 38 percent to 42 percent and 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 Step

- Description**
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. Participate in AVID school wide showcase

Person Responsible Liz Logan (liz.logan@keysschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

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 V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: High School Acceleration				\$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	0131 - Marathon School	General Fund		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: After School Budget</i>			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELL and SWD Subgroup Performance				\$0.00
					Total:	\$2,500.00