Monroe County School District

Marathon School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Marathon School

350 SOMBRERO BEACH RD, Marathon, FL 33050

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1071

Demographics

Principal: Christine Paul 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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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.

Table of Contents

Marathon School

350 SOMBRERO BEACH RD, Marathon, FL 33050

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1071

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	55%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

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

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 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.

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
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
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 BLPT member.
Driscoll, Robert	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. Robert Driscoll is the Science department BLPT member.
Hare, David	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. David Hare is the ESE department BLPT member.
McDonald, Sean	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. Sean McDonald is the Electives department BLPT member.
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 Science/ History department BLPT member.
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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		school's decision-making processes. Diana Walker is the Middle school department BLPT member.
Winegardner, Haley	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. Haley Winegardner is the mathematics department BLPT member.
Konrath, Teresa	Graduation Coach	The Graduation Coach works with junior and senior students to meet graduation requirements. Typically meeting graduation requirements includes getting caught up and attaining necessary assessment scores. The graduation coach also identifies at risk sophomores and freshmen. The graduation coach regularly meets with the 12th grade horizontal team.
Grostefon, Cathy	School Counselor	The grades 10-12 School Counselor /CCAPS Counselor works with students in grade 10-12 to prepare them for graduation and post secondary opportunities.
Veldheer, Ja-Ronika	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal role is to preform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist the building principal in the development and continuous implementation of the a high school program which promotes the educational well-being of each student in the school. Ja-Ronika Veldheer is one of two assistant principals at Marathon High School
Tyler, Trevor	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal role is to preform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist the building principal in the development and continuous implementation of the a high school program which promotes the educational well-being of each student in the school. Ja-Ronika Veldheer is one of two assistant principals at Marathon High School

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Christine Paul A

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

705

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

5

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

5

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	116	85	99	128	118	85	76	707
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21	26	18	21	13	11	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	7	9	3	1	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	3	11	6	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	2	8	4	26
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	21	37	48	33	24	15	203
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	14	28	28	22	11	9	138
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	10	14	19	22	11	13	6	95

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/23/2022

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	87	94	108	125	81	88	88	671
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	20	29	39	24	18	27	173
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	4	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	6	5	3	1	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	5	4	6	10	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	25	38	41	26	27	22	195
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	27	20	31	16	13	8	131
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	5	15	16	24	13	13	14	100

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	2	6	2	7	4	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	8	5	24

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	87	94	108	125	81	88	88	671
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	20	29	39	24	18	27	173
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	4	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	6	5	3	1	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	5	4	6	10	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	25	38	41	26	27	22	195
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	27	20	31	16	13	8	131
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	5	15	16	24	13	13	14	100

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	2	6	2	7	4	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	8	5	24

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	42%	56%	52%				51%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	54%	52%				52%	58%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	42%	41%				46%	39%	42%
Math Achievement	51%	47%	41%				53%	52%	51%
Math Learning Gains	57%	50%	48%				53%	58%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	55%	49%				47%	51%	45%
Science Achievement	52%	64%	61%				51%	76%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	78%	68%				71%	74%	73%

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	45%	57%	-12%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	42%	58%	-16%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2022					
	2019	45%	60%	-15%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

				MATH		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	53%	53%	0%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	56%	61%	-5%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2022					
	2019	33%	61%	-28%	46%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

				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	36%	56%	-20%	48%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	61%	72%	-11%	67%	-6%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	62%	80%	-18%	71%	-9%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	71%	74%	-3%	70%	1%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	45%	70%	-25%	61%	-16%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	56%	69%	-13%	57%	-1%

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	22	27	27	27	52	39	24	47		88	21
ELL	29	39	30	37	47	37	21	53		80	
BLK	39	47		40	83		30	92			
HSP	36	44	32	45	54	47	44	59	61	86	43
WHT	49	44	38	58	57	52	63	68	63	100	47
FRL	36	42	33	46	54	60	45	64	62	91	37
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	18	18	10	19	25	23	23	31			
ELL	23	36	29	43	44	30	17	40		60	
BLK	36	36		35	30		36				
HSP	34	37	24	42	36	27	35	60	69	82	49

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
WHT	56	49	44	61	42	35	55	76	79	93	60
FRL	35	37	22	41	34	25	33	65	63	81	49
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	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

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	659
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	55
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	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

a. ELA achievement, learning gains, and lowest 25% are all down compared to pre-COVID scores. Math achievement scores are lower than pre-COVID however learning gains and lowest 25% exceed pre-COVID scores. Science Achievement is up and Social Studies achievement is down.
b. ELL and BLK subgroups exceeded 2019 scores. Interesting to note SWD subgroup scores exceeded 2022 however remain lower than federal index.
c. Currently 59.5% of the 2022-2023 cohort has completed all graduation requires with the exception of enrollment in current classes. 40.5% of the 22-23 cohort does not have the required graduation assessments or a concordant/comparative score, 3.9% do not have the required 2.0 GPA, and 11.3% are missing required courses.

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

a. Based on 2022 FSA and STAR Reading scores, ELA achievement continues to be an area in need of improvement. In addition ELA learning gains are an area in need of improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

a. Contributing factors to FSA ELA scores were transient ELA teachers in grades 6 and 7.
b. New actions include training on new ELA curriculum aligned to BEST standards and implementation with fidelity of ELA curriculum and new actions include continued use of reading intervention specialist received mid-year 2021-2022.

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

a. The subgroup ELL showed considerable improvement moving from 36% (federal index) to 43% (federal index). This increase in the subgroup moved the ELL subgroup out of monitoring.
b. Math FSA learning gains and lowest 25% learning gains both showed improvement from 37.3% to 57% and from 26.8% to 52% respectively.

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

a. Data analysis chats regarding test scores by the graduation coach and specific key instruction by the ELL teacher were contributing factors to improvement. Key planning and lesson delivery around assessment dates were also contributing factors.
b. After school tutoring and data chats were two strategies used to impact math learning gain scores.

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

a. Continue with graduation coach and systematic instruction for ELLs. Expand ELL model to learning strategies classes for SWD. Use Learning Walks to analysis classroom learning.
b. Implement with fidelity ELA and math curriculum aligned with the BEST standards.
c. Use key student engagement strategies.

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.

a. Professional development is offered in each content area. As an AVID district focus, AVID focus topics are offered as well. Teachers must attend an ERPD professional development of their choice. Time is set as side for teachers to meet throughout the year. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are developed based on the professional development topics. Teachers implement best practices and learning strategies learned via the ERPD PLC.

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

a. Consistent monitoring of PM FAST and STAR as well as Learning Walk Observation data to increase teacher ownership of data.

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 Graduation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Students who graduate from high school are more likely to enter the workforce as contributing members of society.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goal at Marathon High School is to increase our graduation rate each year. The last three graduation metrics have been 85%, 88%, and 94%. The 2022-2023 graduation goal for Marathon High School is 95%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	An excel spreadsheet of graduation data metrics for the 2022-2023 cohort is used to monitor the cohort graduation rate. The graduation rate will be updated at least twice quarterly at the mid and end of each quarter and reviewed by the school leadership team. Additional updates occur after SAT and ACT testing.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cathy Grostefon (cathy.grostefon@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The evidence based strategy is to identify at-risk students. Students are at-risk for graduation because of low GPA, missing graduation assessment scores, missing credits, or any combination thereof. A sortable Excel file enables data analysis by cohort level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Identifying student that are at-risk for graduation is essential in helping students complete graduation requirements.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Complete cohort analysis of three required graduation indicators: GPA, required graduation assessments, and required credits. The CCAPs Counselor and Graduation Coach each focus on specific graduation elements and collaborate as a team to ensure all graduation requirements are met.

Person Responsible	Cathy Grostefon (cathy.grostefon@keysschools.com)

2. Meet with students who are at-risk of not graduating and develop credit recovery contracts to recover missing credit. Student, parent, counselor, and principal sign contract. Schedule students into in person classes to recover missing credits if student schedule permits. Enroll students in online credit recovery classes if schedule does not permit. Check progress every two weeks. Conference with student as needed. Celebrate successes.

Person Responsible	Cathy Grostefon (cathy.grostefon@keysschools.com)

3. Meet with students at-risk of not graduating because of GPA. Map out plan with student to meet GPA requirements. See credit recovery contract outlined above.

Person Responsible	Cathy Grostefon (cathy.grostefon@keysschools.com)

4. Analyze cohort data for students missing required assessment scores. Graduation Coach meets with students and plans when to take assessments. Graduation Coach steers students to afterschool tutoring for SAT and ACT prep.

Person Responsible   Teresa Konrath (teresa.konrath@keysschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The ESSA subgroup Students With Disabilities (SWD) is a concern because this subgroup is below the Federal Index of 41%. Additionally this subgroup represents 25% of the total student population. Increased learning levels within this subgroup should reverberate throughout all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	For the 2022-2023 school year, the goal of MHS is to increase the Level 3-5 achievement of SWD students by 5% in both ELA and Math. During the 2021-2022 school year, 88% (L1 - 63.4% & L2 - 14.6%) of SWD students scored at Levels 1 or 2 on the ELA FSA and 72.9% (L1 - 49.4% and L2 – 23.5%) of SWD students scored levels 1 and 2 on the Math FSA. This was a 6.3% increase in ELA Level 1 and 2 from the 2020-2021 school year and a decrease of 8% in Math Level 1 and 2 students.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	FAST Reading and FAST Math as well as STAR Reading and STAR Math will be used to monitor SWD student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ja-Ronika Veldheer (ja-ronika.veldheer@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	According to the U.S. DOE vocabulary instruction is a high yield instructional strategy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	Vocabulary instruction is pivotal to students' understanding of new concepts and skills. Targeting grade level in both core and elective content area words to explicitly teach students provides needed language to process learning and make connections with existing knowledge. According to the U.S. DOE vocabulary instruction is a high yield instructional strategy. Learning strategies teachers will reinforce grade level vocabulary as well as content area vocabulary provided by the general education teachers. In addition general education teachers will use high yield instructional strategies within their instruction.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for 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.

Collect baseline data on how vocabulary instruction is currently implemented.

Person Responsible   Ja-Ronika Veldheer (ja-ronika.veldheer@keysschools.com)

Provide a vocabulary training based on best practices at the next faculty meeting. Quality vocabulary instruction will be emphasized during department meetings. Learning strategy teachers will increase their efficacy for vocabulary instruction and student engagement.

Person Responsible   Ja-Ronika Veldheer (ja-ronika.veldheer@keysschools.com)

Collect data weekly through the 2022-2023 Learning Walk Classroom Observation tool. Data on vocabulary instruction will be discussed with learning strategy teachers, departments, and BLPT.

Person Responsible   Wendy McPherson (wendy.mcpherson@keysschools.com)

Classrooms identified as needing more vocabulary support and training will be targeted for additional learning opportunities. Lesson plans will be reviewed for vocabulary components and high yield strategies.

Person Responsible   Ja-Ronika Veldheer (ja-ronika.veldheer@keysschools.com)

Proactively schedule ESE students into learning strategies classes for additional support per their IEP.

Person Responsible   Cathy Grostefon (cathy.grostefon@keysschools.com)

Provide specialized ESE support training for general education faculty, ESE paraprofessionals, and learning strategies teachers. Trainings include MCSD ESE Best Practices and Individualized Education Plan Implementation for full faculty, 2022-2023 Paraprofessionals: Professionals Who Promote Success for paraprofessionals, and MCSD ESE Best Practice IEP for learning strategies teachers and advocates.

Person Responsible   Trevor Tyler (trevor.tyler@keysschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Literacy skill is critical to student achievement. During the 2021-2022 school year, 57.5% of Marathon High School students scored a Level 1 or Level 2.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Through the use of strategic student engagement classroom structures, MHS will increase ELA achievement in Levels 3-5 by 5%. The specific student engagement structures are learning targets, guided practice, catch and release, cold calling, and lesson debrief.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monitoring will take place through the 2022-2023 Learning Walk Classroom Observation form, through FAST progress monitoring, and STAR Reading progress monitoring. The Learning Walk observation form will show if strategies are being implemented within the classroom consistently and with fidelity. Progress monitoring through FAST and STAR data will monitor student growth and identify areas of need.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wendy McPherson (wendy.mcpherson@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Implementation of five student engagement classroom structures: Learning targets, guided practice, catch and release, cold calling, and lesson debrief based on research from the book, Leaders of Their Own Learning: Transforming School through Student-Engaged Assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	When these five student engagement classroom structures (learning targets, guided practice, catch and release, cold calling, and lesson debrief) are implemented with fidelity, the classroom shifts to allow the teacher to become the facilitator and puts the onus of learning on the students.

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.

Identify ELA students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on the FSA ELA. Place these students on a watch list.

Person Responsible Ja-Ronika Veldheer (ja-ronika.veldheer@keysschools.com)

Meet with ELA department team to share watch list and review/train critical classroom structure processes as evidenced by agendas.

| **Person Responsible** | Wendy McPherson (wendy.mcpherson@keysschools.com) |

Tweak classroom learning walk tool to record observations of the five strategies. Collect data weekly.

| **Person Responsible** | Wendy McPherson (wendy.mcpherson@keysschools.com) |

Review data from classroom learning walk tool bi-weekly with BLPT team members who review data with respective grade level teams

| **Person Responsible** | Wendy McPherson (wendy.mcpherson@keysschools.com) |

Analyze progress monitoring data from PM1 and PM2.

| **Person Responsible** | Ja-Ronika Veldheer (ja-ronika.veldheer@keysschools.com) |

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.

MHS is a PBIS school within a PBIS district. A committee of faculty and staff work together to guide the MHS campus body by teaching expectations and good behavior in order to build a positive school culture and environment. MHS follows the iBElieve behavioral expectations of BE Safe, BE Responsible, BE Respectful, BE Ready to Learn, and BE Empowered campus-wide. The behavioral expectations outline the roles of teachers, parents, school admin, and district-wide staff promoting a consistent understanding of the BEs and expected behavior. A group of leadership students work to bring forth the student voice as well as provide fun engaging events campus-wide.

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

A committee of faculty and staff promote PBIS tenants across campus. Teachers, school admin, and district-wide staff follow the iBElieve behavioral expectations and the PBIS tenants. The leadership students provide fun and engaging events that students like to do. The MHS School Advisory Council (SAC) provides important perceptions, ideas, and has a place to express concerns.