

Marion County Public Schools

# Dunnellon Middle School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>15</b> |

## Dunnellon Middle School

21005 CHESTNUT ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 78%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 43%   |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       | C       | C       | C*      |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Dunnellon Middle School will provide an environment of learning that will focus on the needs of individual students. Every student at Dunnellon Middle School can succeed!

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

D-eveloping  
M-inds for  
S-uccess

Dunnellon Middle School will be a school where the focus is on student learning.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name                | Title               |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Lindsey, Gwen       | Assistant Principal |
| Durden, Donna       | Assistant Principal |
| Samler, Carmela     | Instructional Coach |
| Smallridge, Delbert | Principal           |
| Vazquez, Maria      | Dean                |
| Peluffo, Evelyn     | School Counselor    |
| Long, Marika        | School Counselor    |

#### Duties

##### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Dunnellon Middle School is served by one principal, Del Smallridge and two assistant principals, Donna Durden and Gwen Lindsey. Mr. Smallridge returns this year as his seventh year at the helm. His duties include assuring instruction aligns to state standards, containing continuous improvement through professional development, designing instruction for student success, developing partnerships with the administrative staff, teachers, parents and the Dunnellon Community. Mr. Smallridge also strives to create a supportive culture where each individual feels valued.

As the assistant principal for curriculum, Mrs. Durden's primary focus includes developing and maintaining a master schedule to fulfill all students' needs, supporting the professional development of all stakeholders, viewing academic data to facilitate instructional strategies and curriculum alignment; and to enhance student achievement with available resources. As the assistant principal for discipline, Gwen Lindsey's primary functions (along with our Dean, Maria Vazquez) include communicating the schools mission and vision to all stakeholders, maintaining a safe facility while establishing a positive school culture, as well as an effective student discipline program that enhances student achievement.

Our instructional coach Carmella Samler works extensively with our reading teachers to improve instruction in the classroom. She monitors data on our reading students and helps to make adjustments in reading placement when appropriate. Our two guidance counselors are Marika Long and Evelyn Peluffo. The ladies work with all of our students at DMS to support emotional health and provide guidance and direction re: selection of programs and classes. The counselors also work with our teachers to monitor student achievement and when needed address students of concern as identified by our leadership team. The counselors also help facilitate the MTSS process for academic and behavioral concerns.

## Early Warning Systems

### Year 2017-18

#### 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 | 31 | 38 | 15 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 84  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 72 | 63 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 210 |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 25 | 10 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 67 | 45 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 163 |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |

#### The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |     | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |     |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 76 | 81 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 227 |       |

#### 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 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

#### Date this data was collected

Monday 8/13/2018

### Year 2016-17 - 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 |     |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 46 | 13 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 85  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 21 | 19 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 26 | 14 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 57  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 53 | 56 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 163 |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |    |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23 |       |

#### Year 2016-17 - 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 | 26 | 46 | 13 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 85  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 21 | 19 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 26 | 14 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 57  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 53 | 56 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 163 |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |    |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23 |       |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

Proficiency in ELA for 17-18 was 45%. This category was the lowest figure for all of the 9 categories used in calculating the school grade in 17-18. Although that figure has improved in past years from 42%(15-16) to 44%(16-17) and now stands at 45%(17-18), ELA Proficiency has been an area of weakness as compared to other areas such as math achievement or math learning gains. Thus, it has been the trend that ELA performance has been a weakness over the past three years.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

Learning gains in ELA was the only data component that showed a decline from the prior year. In 17-18 our ELA learning gains were measured at 50% as compared to 52% in 16-17, and 53% in 15-16. All other data components showed increases with the exception of Civics that was static at 63% (17-18) as compared to 63% (16-17).

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

Learning gains in math is an area of strength for DMS. Our Math Learning gains for 17-18 were an impressive 69% which was 12 points higher than the state average of 57%. This was an improvement over the 16-17 scores in which DMS had Math Learning gains at 62% when the state average was 57%.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

Learning Gains in Math (lowest 25%) showed the most improvement at 63% (10 point gain) as compared to 53% in 16-17, which was an improvement of 5 points from 15-16 Learning Gains in Math (lowest 25%) when they were measured at 48%. Yes, Learning Gains in Math have shown a trend of improvement from 15-16 to 16-17 and 17-18 with a 15 point gain (5 points + 10 points). Learning Gains in Math (lowest 25%) is an area of strength for DMS.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

We have had an intensive math program in place for several years. We serve all level 1 and 2 students in FSA math with an additional math class to specifically address areas of weakness in mathematics from previous years. We have also offered tutoring in mathematics before and after school for several years. We have made steady gains each year in both math proficiency levels and learning gains as well as math learning gains for our lowest 25%. We are now performing above the district and state average in math learning gains and bottom quartile math learning gains. We currently are equal to the state's average (58%) in math proficiency for DMS.

**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      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 45%    | 47%      | 53%   | 42%    | 44%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 50%    | 50%      | 54%   | 53%    | 46%      | 53%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 48%    | 45%      | 47%   | 55%    | 39%      | 45%   |
| Math Achievement            | 58%    | 52%      | 58%   | 53%    | 47%      | 55%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 69%    | 61%      | 57%   | 63%    | 50%      | 55%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 63%    | 52%      | 51%   | 48%    | 38%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         | 48%    | 46%      | 52%   | 50%    | 45%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 63%    | 66%      | 72%   | 60%    | 58%      | 67%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------|
|                                 | 6                                 | 7       | 8       |           |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 31 (26)                           | 38 (46) | 15 (13) | 84 (85)   |
| One or more suspensions         | 75 (26)                           | 72 (21) | 63 (19) | 210 (66)  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 7 (17)                            | 25 (26) | 10 (14) | 42 (57)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 51 (54)                           | 67 (53) | 45 (56) | 163 (163) |
|                                 | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)     |
|                                 | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)     |
|                                 | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)     |
|                                 | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (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                    | 2018 | 40%    | 44%      | -4%                        | 52%   | -12%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 37%    | 44%      | -7%                        | 52%   | -15%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2018 | 41%    | 43%      | -2%                        | 51%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 38%    | 42%      | -4%                        | 52%   | -14%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2018 | 53%    | 49%      | 4%                         | 58%   | -5%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 54%    | 48%      | 6%                         | 55%   | -1%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2018 | 46%    | 42%      | 4%                         | 52%   | -6%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 39%    | 37%      | 2%                         | 51%   | -12%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2018 | 61%    | 49%      | 12%                        | 54%   | 7%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 52%    | 47%      | 5%                         | 53%   | -1%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 22%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2018 | 45%    | 43%      | 2%                         | 45%   | 0%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 58%    | 43%      | 15%                        | 46%   | 12%                     |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -13%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                | 2018 | 47%    | 46%      | 1%                         | 50%   | -3%                     |
|                   | 2017 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017        |        |          |                       |       |                    |

| CIVICS EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year       | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018       | 62%    | 64%      | -2%                   | 71%   | -9%                |
| 2017       | 63%    | 64%      | -1%                   | 69%   | -6%                |
| Compare    |        | -1%      |                       |       |                    |

| HISTORY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017        |        |          |                       |       |                    |

| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018        | 100%   | 57%      | 43%                   | 62%   | 38%                |
| 2017        | 100%   | 53%      | 47%                   | 60%   | 40%                |
| Compare     |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017         |        |          |                       |       |                    |

### Subgroup Data

**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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| SWD       | 3        | 31     | 32          | 15        | 33      | 33           | 14       | 20      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL       | 16       | 43     | 44          | 34        | 62      | 61           | 17       | 42      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK       | 20       | 35     | 38          | 39        | 51      | 64           | 33       | 70      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP       | 44       | 55     | 51          | 53        | 69      | 67           | 29       | 62      | 57        |                   |                     |
| MUL       | 29       | 25     |             | 44        | 59      |              |          | 30      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT       | 49       | 51     | 50          | 63        | 73      | 63           | 61       | 66      | 67        |                   |                     |
| FRL       | 41       | 50     | 47          | 53        | 67      | 63           | 41       | 62      | 55        |                   |                     |

**2017 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       | 9        | 37     | 41          | 19        | 45      | 46           | 13       | 19      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL       | 14       | 47     | 44          | 18        | 43      | 34           | 12       | 45      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK       | 32       | 37     | 20          | 35        | 43      |              | 40       | 77      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP       | 36       | 52     | 47          | 42        | 53      | 43           | 35       | 56      | 48        |                   |                     |
| MUL       | 41       | 52     | 27          | 46        | 67      |              | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT       | 48       | 53     | 42          | 60        | 67      | 61           | 48       | 68      | 49        |                   |                     |
| FRL       | 40       | 49     | 40          | 49        | 60      | 50           | 42       | 58      | 38        |                   |                     |

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

**Areas of Focus:**

| Activity #1                   |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>                  | Continue to offer Intensive Math to all level 1 and 2 students in grades 6-8 and to reduce class sizes in general math classes in grades 6-8.   |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | If we continue to fund two additional math teachers with our Title I budget to help reduce class size and provide Intensive Math classes to all non-proficient students then the percentage of proficient FSA Math scores will increase by 5% and the percentage of level 1 and 2 students will decrease by 5%. Our math learning gains for 17-18 were an incredible 69% (12 points higher than the state average) and our bottom quartile math learning gains for 17-18 were at 63% which was also 12 points higher than the state average! These figures certainly speak to the success that we are having with our math programs at DMS. We need to continue to keep this area of focus as we have seen the impact on student achievement and posted learning gains. |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | If DMS continues to fund two additional math teachers to help reduce class size and provide intensive math classes to all non-proficient students, then the percentage of proficient FSA math scores will increase by 5% (Baseline 58% to Target 63%).  |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)  |
| Action Step                   |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | The principal will maintain two Title I math teachers in the Title I Budget and in the SIP for the 2018-2019 school year and build a master schedule using the two additional teachers to either reduce class size in the general math classes or to teach Intensive Math classes to all level 1 and 2 students.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)  |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | We will monitor effectiveness by reviewing I-Ready data after each assessment window. The intensive math teachers will work and plan with the general math teachers to monitor their students' progress. The intensive math teachers will focus their teaching time on skills that the students are struggling with in the general math classes.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)  |

| Activity #2                   |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>                  | Provide additional support to teachers and students in Rigorous Teaching Strategies in both ELA and Reading.  |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | Proficiency in ELA has consistently been the weakest area of data components for DMS. In 17-18 the ELA proficiency percentage was 45% as compared to 16-17 (44%) and 15-16 (42%). Although there has been a slight improvement trend over the past few years, ELA proficiency continues to lag behind math, science and civics. If we hire a Content Area Specialist in Literacy to coach teachers and to assist with Staff Development, then Dunnellon Middle School's percent of proficient ELA students will increase by 10% as measured by FSA. ( CAS will be a 1/2 time position.) The CAS will assist teachers in implementing rigorous teaching strategies to increase the percentage of proficient ELA scores. The CAS will train teachers in AVID strategies such as Socratic Circle, Focused Note Taking, WICOR strategies, Tutorials, etc. |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | If we hire a Content Area Specialist in Literacy to coach teachers and to assist with Staff Development, then Dunnellon Middle School's percent of proficient ELA students will increase by 10% as measured by FSA. Baseline 45%, Target 55%.   |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Carmela Samler (carmela.samler@marion.k12.fl.us)  |
| Action Step                   |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | Our CAS will offer PD to the entire faculty at least two time per month covering AVID teaching strategies mentioned in the Intended Outcome. Each quarter ELA and Reading teachers will complete classroom walk throughs in other teachers' classrooms that will be modeling the same AVID strategies learned by the PD provided by Mrs. Samler. Teachers will then have help implementing the new strategies by using what they have learned in the walkthrough, the PD provided by the CAS, and with assistance from Mrs. Samler if needed. This process will continue each quarter for the entire year.<br>DMS will purchase agenda planners for ALL students. This will provide a tool for teachers to communicate with back and forth with parents via written notes.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Carmela Samler (carmela.samler@marion.k12.fl.us)  |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | Effectiveness will be monitored by reviewing the number of teachers volunteering to model the strategies and by the number of teachers signing up to complete walkthroughs. Once the walkthroughs are completed, effectiveness will be monitored by the administration by seeing the strategies being used in the classrooms when completing classroom observations. A review of i-Ready (AP1, AP2, AP3) student data will also serve as a measure of effectiveness.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)  |

| Activity #3                   |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>                  | Provide Tutoring opportunities to struggling students in ELA and Math beyond normal school hours.  |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | Proficiency in ELA has consistently been the weakest area of data components for DMS. In 17-18 the ELA proficiency percentage was 45% as compared to 16-17 (44%) and 15-16 (42%). Although there has been a slight improvement trend over the past few years, ELA proficiency continues to lag behind math, science and civics. There is a need to offer additional assistance to students in the area of ELA beyond regular school hours. With respect to math, DMS has learning gains (69%) that are 12 points higher than the state average of 57% and bottom quartile learning gains of (63%) that are also 12 points higher than the state average! Our tutoring program that we have had in place the past few years has helped contribute to this success. Most of the students involved in tutoring are seeking assistance in math. We need to continue our work in this area. |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | If DMS can provide tutoring opportunities to students who are struggling in either math or ELA, then FSA proficiency levels in both ELA and Math will increase by 5% AND Learning gains in the bottom 25% will increase by 5% in both ELA and Math as measured by the FSA in ELA and math.   |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)   |
| Action Step                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | The principal will hire two teachers to tutor students in ELA and Math before school three days per week. A tutoring schedule will be established and the guidance counselors will identify students who could benefit from additional instruction in ELA or math.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)   |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | We will monitor effectiveness by evaluating I-Ready data after each assessment period.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Carmela Samler (carmela.samler@marion.k12.fl.us)   |

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Please see the school PFEP

DMS will seek to invite parents and community members to participate in school activities such as SAC, school events (student performances, student athletics, parent nights, etc.). The school already has strong relationships with local organizations who provide support to various school programs. The Dunnellon Community Thrift Shop, VFW, American Legion, Dunnellon Woman's Club and Sonic are local organizations that regularly support our school. DMS also has a strong working relationship with the

Mayor's office, Dunnellon Police Dept. and the local fire department. DMS offers an orientation program to all students before school begins in August. This allows parents and students the opportunity to meet teachers and tour the campus before the first day of school. DMS also holds an Open House in September (evening event) to allow parents to follow their student's schedule and hear from each teacher about classroom expectations and curriculum utilized in the course. DMS will use Twitter and Peachjar along with the Skylert messaging system to communicate with parents and to invite them to various events. DMS will also provide all students with an agenda planner to be used as tool to open the lines of communication between home and school. DMS will be conducting several parent nights tied to a specific core content area (math, science, ELA or social studies) where parents will learn how to help their students at home with the subject area.

#### **PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

#### **Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

DMS addresses the social-emotional needs of its students in a variety of ways. Students are able to request to see our school counselors or dean of students when they have an issue that they want the assistance of a school official. The school can assess a situation with a student and if needed, make a referral for additional services when dealing with serious issues of violence or mental health concerns such as suicide. We utilize the services of The Centers at times with our students. The school district has an arrangement with The Centers where we can make free referrals for violence risk or suicide risk. The guidance office also helps to facilitate the services of outside counselors that come to school to work with our students.

#### **Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

The school coordinates with its two feeder elementary schools to conduct an orientation for 5th graders before they leave elementary school. The orientation is designed to ease the transition from 5th to 6th grade. The school also conducts an orientation for ALL students the week BEFORE the school year begins. This allows students the opportunity to visit the campus, view their schedule, and meet their teachers. In a similar manner, we actually transport all of our 8th graders to Dunnellon High School for a school tour, orientation, and scheduling session. This is designed to ease the transition from 8th to 9th grade.

#### **Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

The school determines the total needs of its students in the areas of reading and math remediation, special education, electives, acceleration classes, etc. to help determine a master schedule. We look at the resources available in our staffing plan and adjust personnel within their areas of certification to meet the needs of the school. This process takes place over the summer. As the school year begins and we know the actual number of students that we have to work with...we make adjustments in the master schedule to accommodate school needs. The leadership team collaborates to determine how to utilize our Title I funds and offers input into developing the Title I Budget. Due to the small size of our team we meet informally almost each day as we jointly supervise the school cafeteria. We are constantly discussing school needs and how to allocate resources as new resources become available. Resource inventory such as Title I Budget, School Based Budget, and various school accounts are reviewed on a

monthly basis. These records are maintained by the school secretary. If additional monies should become available to the school, the leadership team will make a joint decision (consensus) as to how the resources can best meet the needs of the school. Non-consumable Title I resources, will be bar coded and inventoried annually. Consumables will be maintained in a central location, where administrators and the school secretary will be responsible for distribution of resources.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

We offer an orientation to career occupations course to our 6th grade students. We also work with the local high school to allow their personnel time to come talk with our 8th grade students about various vocational programs available at the high school. Our high schools with magnet programs come to our school to share information about vocational programs and magnet programs available to our students as they enter 9th grade. The school also obtains information from our various high school in the district and publicizes specialized programs that prepare students for a particular college or career track. This helps students be aware of options that are available regarding school choice. We also offer classes in Business, Agriculture, Computers, TV production, Art, and Music. Students learn about various careers available in the respective classes.

### Part V: Budget

Total:

\$158,006.00