



District-Managed Turnaround Plan – Step 1 (TOP-1)

Alachua County Public Schools
Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings Elementary

Due: September 1

Form Number DMT, TOP-1, incorporated in Rule 6A-1.099811, F.A.C., effective November 2024

District-Managed Turnaround Plan—Step 1 (TOP-1)

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to guide districts to plan for the implementation of a district-managed turnaround plan to improve the school's grade to a "C" or higher. The district shall submit a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to the Department by September 1, pursuant to sections (ss.) 1001.42(21) and 1008.33(4)(a), F.S.

Directions

Districts shall complete this Step 1 form for each school that is required to implement a district-managed turnaround plan. This plan must be submitted by the district to the Regional Executive Director (RED) for review and feedback before submitting it to the RED and the BSI. The local school board must approve the plan. This completed form must be signed by the superintendent or authorized representative and emailed to the RED and BSI@fldoe.org, no later than September 1. The subject line of the email must include the district name, school name and TOP-1.

School

In the box below, identify the name and MSID number of the school that will be supported through the district-managed turnaround plan.

School Name/ MSID Number
Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings Elementary/0341

Stakeholder Engagement

In the box below, describe the district's efforts to engage and involve stakeholders, including the Community Assessment Team (CAT), to determine causes for low performance and make recommendations for school improvement. Include a list of names and affiliations of CAT members. The RED or their designee shall be a member of the CAT. Include a list of meetings that were held regarding the development of the district-managed turnaround plan, as well as scheduled meetings that will be held during the implementation of the plan.

Names and affiliation of CAT members:

District

- A. Erica Warring – Principal
- B. Shanee Martin – Assistant Principal
- C. Kichelle Sheppard – Assistant Principal
- D. Jim Kuhn – District Turnaround Principal
- E. Nannette Dell – Executive Director - Elementary Education
- F. Dr. Catherine Atria – Deputy Superintendent
- G. Dr. Kamela Patton – Superintendent

Bureau of School Improvement (BSI)

- Sandy Brusca – Regional Executive Director (Region 2)
- Tiffany Towns - BSI School Improvement Specialist

District-Managed Turnaround Plan—Step 1 (TOP-1)

Dates of CAT meetings (held and upcoming meetings):

CAT # 1 - September 10, 2026 at 4:30 p.m.

CAT # 2 - January 14, 2027 at 4:30 p.m.

CAT # 3 - May 25, 2027 at 4:30 p.m.

What School Data Was Analyzed

Three years of FLDOE school grade and Accountability Components by Subgroup data (2023-2024 to 2025-2026) covering ELA/Math achievement and learning gains, Science achievement and results for All Students, Students with Disabilities, Black/African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups.

School Grade History

Year	Grade	% of Points
2023-2024	D	32%
2024-2025	C	41%
2025-2026	F	28%

All Students

Component	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026	Trend
ELA Achievement	16%	26%	19%	▲ +3
Grade 3 ELA Ach.	7%	33%	16%	▲ +9
ELA Learning Gains	43%	52%	36%	▼ -7
ELA LG, Low 25%	48%	82%	52%	▲ +4
Math Achievement	18%	16%	12%	▼ -6
Math Learning Gains	40%	38%	32%	▼ -8
Math LG, Low 25%	59%	62%	47%	▼ -12
Science Achievement	22%	21%	11%	▼ -11

2024-2025 peaked across nearly every component; 2025-2026 erased most gains and pushed Math and Science below their 2023-2024 baseline. Math declined each year.

Students With Disabilities

Component	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026	Trend
ELA Achievement	3%	11%	4%	▲ +1
Grade 3 ELA Ach.	0%	8%	8%	▲ +8
ELA Learning Gains	29%	53%	26%	▼ -3
Math Achievement	3%	14%	11%	▲ +8

District-Managed Turnaround Plan—Step 1 (TOP-1)

Math Learning Gains	24%	41%	22%	▼ -2
Science Achievement	9%	—	—	N/A

Same rise-then-fall shape as schoolwide data; the lowest-performing subgroup every year in every component.

Black/African American Students

Component	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026	Trend
ELA Achievement	17%	23%	19%	▲ +2
Grade 3 ELA Ach.	8%	28%	16%	▲ +8
ELA Learning Gains	45%	51%	36%	▼ -9
ELA LG, Low 25%	52%	78%	60%	▲ +8
Math Achievement	17%	15%	11%	▼ -6
Math Learning Gains	40%	38%	29%	▼ -11
Math LG, Low 25%	54%	62%	47%	▼ -7
Science Achievement	25%	18%	9%	▼ -16

Tracks the schoolwide trend; Science had the greatest decline (25% to 9%).

Economically Disadvantaged Students

Component	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026	Trend
ELA Achievement	15%	23%	19%	▲ +4
Grade 3 ELA Ach.	5%	30%	16%	▲ +11
ELA Learning Gains	43%	51%	38%	▼ -5
ELA LG, Low 25%	48%	80%	52%	▲ +4
Math Achievement	16%	16%	12%	▼ -4
Math Learning Gains	39%	39%	33%	▼ -6
Math LG, Low 25%	59%	63%	50%	▼ -9
Science Achievement	19%	17%	9%	▼ -10

Nearly identical shape to Black/African American students; Math flat-to-declining all three years.

2025-2026 Snapshot by Subgroup

Subgroup	ELA	Math	Science
All Students	19%	12%	11%
Students With Disabilities	4%	11%	—
Black/African American	19%	11%	9%
Hispanic	10%	10%	—
Economically Disadvantaged	19%	12%	9%

Key Takeaways

- 2024-2025 showed improvement across subgroups, while 2025-2026 saw declines in many of those gains, aligning with the overall school grade change from C to F (Overall Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) decreased from 41% to 28%).
- Mathematics remained the most persistent area of concern, with performance either declining or remaining relatively flat across all transitions and subgroups over the three-year period.
- Science experienced the largest overall decline among the tested subjects, with schoolwide performance and results for Black/African American and Economically Disadvantaged students decreasing substantially.
- Students with Disabilities (SWD) continued to represent the largest achievement discrepancy among student groups and finished 2025-2026 with the lowest overall performance in the school.

Identified Causes of Low Performance

The F grade reflects a breakdown in consistency of tier 1 instruction, not one isolated cause:

- Curriculum and instructional alignment: Discrepancies between instruction, state standards, and assessed content
- Low-level Learning targets and limited evidence of student learning
 - Based on 171 classroom walkthroughs conducted during the 2025-2026 school year:
 - 91.8% of learning targets observed were at Retrieval or Comprehension level; only 3.5% reached Analysis and 0.6% reached Knowledge Utilization
 - 93.6% of student evidence of learning was at Retrieval or Comprehension level; only 0.58% reached Analysis and 0% reached Knowledge Utilization
 - Students were consistently recalling and explaining content, but almost never analyzing, evaluating, or applying it to novel problems
- Limited explicit modeling and grade-level representations
- Foundational reading and prerequisite math skills not addressed inside grade-level lessons
- Uneven discourse, lack of written reasoning, scaffolds, and progress monitoring
- Attendance, mobility, staffing instability, and lost instructional time — 119 of 338 students (35%) absent 10%+ of days; 34 suspensions; significant staff turnover

Recommendations for School Improvement

Highest Priorities

- Tier 1 instruction will be strengthened schoolwide. This will be accomplished by emphasizing explicit, systematic, and differentiated instructional practices. This approach will ensure that all students, including students with disabilities and those performing below grade level, have consistent access to rigorous, standards-aligned instruction across all content areas and through the use of the district-adopted curriculum. Rawlings' Five Instructional Priorities are:
 - Teach the grade-level standard
 - Use explicit instruction
 - Engage every student
 - Respond to learning evidence
 - Provide access - maintain rigor
 - Use accommodations, scaffolds, visuals, vocabulary support, flexible groups, and purposeful co-teaching without lowering expectations.
- The school will implement structured coaching cycles and schoolwide professional learning on Instructional Empowerment's Model of Instruction, ensuring that all instructional staff receive consistent training, modeling, and feedback to build a shared, high-fidelity instructional framework across every classroom.
- Urgently Improve Mathematics Achievement - Emphasize explicit modeling, conceptual understanding, academic vocabulary, problem solving, and standard-specific intervention.
- Accelerate Literacy and ELA Achievement
 - Strengthen K-2 foundations and 3-5 comprehension via University of Florida Literacy Institute (UFLI)
 - UFLI interventions will be implemented to build foundational literacy skills, particularly in the primary grades, addressing phonemic awareness, phonics, and decoding deficiencies that underlie low ELA achievement in the intermediate grades.
 - Monitor lowest quartile for improvement and movement toward benchmark mastery
- Improve Grade 5 Science Achievement
 - Protect dedicated daily science instructional time while strengthening hands-on investigations, scientific reasoning, and content-area literacy.
- Increase subgroup performance through inclusive support
 - Embed ESE staff in general education for co-teaching; monitor at-risk subgroups every 2-3 weeks.

Collaborative Planning: Action/Correction Cycle

Every session ends with each teacher understanding and able to implement:

- Exact benchmark and prerequisites
- Learning target, success criteria
- Model skills and scaffold skills/information
- Common check for understanding
- Anticipated misconception(s) and same-week correction
- Named coaching roles and next visit date

This structure ensures that collaborative planning does not end with a shared idea, but with a specific, monitorable instruction plan that each teacher can implement immediately and that leadership can verify through the visit cadence below.

District-Managed Turnaround Plan—Step 1 (TOP-1)

Dedicated Support Personnel

The following support structure will be in place to ensure the priorities above are implemented with fidelity and adjusted in response to evidence:

- A dedicated district principal supervisor/turnaround principal is assigned to support school leadership
- A Literacy Specialist and a Math Specialist embedded at the school level
- A Title I Instructional Coach and interventionist
- Weekly, focused, and structured support visits from the district turnaround principal

Support Visit Cadence

Visits from both school-based leadership and the district turnaround principal will follow a consistent, predictable cadence so that instructional feedback reaches classrooms on a weekly cycle rather than intermittently:

Level	Cadence	Focus
School (Principal/AP)	5 walks daily, weekly cycle	Literacy coaching; ESE/interventionist/para push-in; weekly feedback
District (Turnaround Principal and Teaching and Learning Staff)	Weekly, structured support visit	Content-area instruction, interventions, and review of assessment data; feedback delivered following each visit
School, District, and BSI Staff (Principal/AP, Turnaround Principal, District Literacy and UFLI Contacts, BSI Team)	Biweekly	Content area instruction, action plan implementation, future planning

Every walkthrough conducted under the cadence above — whether a school-based daily walk or a district principal supervisor/turnaround principal’s weekly support visit — will be anchored to five Instructional Look-Fors. **Each Look-For is verified through both teacher evidence and corresponding student evidence, so that observers are confirming the practice was not only delivered but received.** Instructional Look-Fors:

1. Explicit Instruction
2. Systematic Instruction
3. Scaffolded Instruction
4. Corrective Feedback
5. Differentiated Instruction

District-Managed Turnaround Plan—Step 1 (TOP-1)

Daily Non-Negotiables

In addition to the five Look-Fors, every classroom is expected to demonstrate the following non-negotiables on a daily basis. These are verified on every walkthrough, regardless of walk type or duration:

- Instructional Focus Board is current and accurate
- Benchmark/Standard, learning target, success criteria, task, and student work are aligned
- Instruction includes modeling, guided practice, and independent practice
- Students engage in academic discourse
- Scaffolds, accommodations, feedback, and small groups are evident and matched to student need

Coaching Plans

Every coaching interaction will be documented in a coaching log that captures the following elements, ensuring that coaching produces a traceable record of instructional change rather than a one-time observation:

- Coaching log entry for the visit
- The attempted teacher action
- The student response and its effect on learning
- The next step to be completed before the following visit
- The look-for trend observed across the coaching cycle
- Any resulting common-task change made in response to the evidence

Together, the action/correction planning cycle, dedicated staffing supports, structured visit cadence, and coaching log create a continuous feedback loop. Identified causes of low performance are addressed through specific instructional moves, those moves are verified through weekly visits, and the evidence gathered directly informs the next cycle of collaborative planning and coaching.

Other information:

District-Managed Turnaround Plan Assurances

The district must agree to ALL of the following assurances by checking the boxes below.

Assurance 1: District Capacity and Support

- ☒ The district shall ensure the district leadership team, which includes the superintendent and district leadership, has an integral role in school improvement. This team may include those in charge of curriculum, general and special education, student services, human resources, professional learning and other areas relevant to school improvement. The district leadership team shall develop and implement the district-managed turnaround plan. The district shall dedicate a position to lead the turnaround effort at the district level. The selected employee shall report directly to the superintendent and support the principal.

District-Managed Turnaround Plan—Step 1 (TOP-1)

☒ The district shall ensure that instructional programs align to Florida's state academic standards for English Language Arts (ELA), mathematics, social studies and science. The district shall provide the evidence that shows instructional programs to be effective with schools that are low-performing with students of similar demographics, how they are different from the previous programs, how the instructional and intervention programs are consistent with s. 1001.215(8), F.S., as well as how remedial and supplemental instruction resources are prioritized for K-3 students with a substantial deficiency in reading and for K-4 students with a substantial deficiency in mathematics. The district shall demonstrate alignment of Florida's state academic standards across grade levels to improve background knowledge in social studies, science and the arts.

☒ The district shall prescribe and require progress monitoring assessments that are aligned to Florida's state academic standards in ELA, mathematics, social studies and science for all students. The district shall ensure that its progress monitoring assessments are predictive of statewide assessment outcomes and provide valid data to support intervention and acceleration for students.

Assurance 2: School Capacity-Leaders and Educators

☒ The district shall ensure the school has effective leaders and educators capable of improving student achievement.

Leaders

☒ The district leadership team, in collaboration with the school, shall develop an annual professional learning plan that provides ongoing tiered support to increase leadership and educator quality.

☒ The district shall ensure the principal has a successful record in leading a turnaround school and the qualifications to support the student population being served. The district shall complete a Principal Change Verification Form when there is a proposed principal change at the school no later than 10 days prior to the proposed principal hire date.

☒ The district shall ensure that the principal will be replaced, unless recommended for retention in collaboration with the Department, upon entry into district-managed turnaround based upon the individual's turnaround record and degree of success, the length of time since turnaround success, the degree of similarity in the student populations and any other factor that would indicate the principal will have turnaround success with this school.

Educators

☒ The district shall ensure the review of practices in hiring, recruitment, retention and reassignment of instructional personnel have been reviewed with priority on student performance data.

☒ The district shall ensure the instructional personnel who do not have a VAM rating and who do not show evidence of increasing student achievement are not rehired at the school.

District-Managed Turnaround Plan—Step 1 (TOP-1)

- ☒ The district must ensure that the percentage of inexperienced teachers, instructional personnel with a VAM rating that is below Effective or out-of-field instructional personnel assigned to the school is at least or at a minimum, not higher than the district average.
- ☒ Ensure that K-12 intensive reading instruction is provided by teachers with a reading certificate, endorsement or micro-credential.

Required Documentation

The district must submit the following as part of the TOP-1: (check boxes)

- ☒ An MOU pursuant to s. 1001.42(21), F.S., shall be emailed to BSI@fldoe.org no later than September 1. The subject line of the email must include: district name, school name, and MOU. If an MOU has not been approved by the district school board, provide a detailed status of negotiations.
- ☒ **The district must submit instructional rosters for this school no later than August 1.** These lists are utilized to ensure that the most proven effective teachers are staffed at the most fragile schools and to verify rosters for teachers eligible to receive an additional district UniSIG allocation.
- ☒ The district must complete the table below by providing the number and percentage of instructional personnel in each of the VAM ratings of Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory for this school and the district.

VAM DATA – School % Compared to District and State %				
VAM Data	Highly Effective (HE)	Effective (EF)	Needs Improvement (NI)	Unsatisfactory (UN)
Number of instructional personnel	1	9	2	0
School %	8%	75%	17%	0%
District %	5.98%	65.79%	17.94%	10.28%
State %	11.30%	65.80%	13.07%	9.84%

District-Managed Turnaround Plan—Step 1 (TOP-1)

Acknowledgment

The district verifies the information in this form and confirms that they have collaborated with the school and the RED.

Name and title of person responsible for completion and submission of TOP-1
Dr. Cathy Atria, Deputy Superintendent James E. Kuhn III, District Turnaround Principal
Contact information: email, phone number
atriacg@gm.sbac.edu, 352-955-7544 kuhnje@gm.sbac.edu, 352-955-7630
Date submitted to the RED and the Bureau of School Improvement (due September 1)
8/14/26
Superintendent signature (or authorized representative)
Kamela Patten
Local School Board Chair Signature (or authorized representative)

Date approved by local school board