

Marion County Public Schools

Dunnellon Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Dunnellon Middle School

21005 CHESTNUT ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: William Mcateer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/3/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Dunnellon Middle School

21005 CHESTNUT ST, Dunnellon, FL 34431

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	70%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lindsey, Gwen	Assistant Principal	Oversee the discipline program at DMS. Responsible for monitoring discipline data and EWS data.
Durden, Donna	Assistant Principal	Oversee the curriculum in all disciplines at DMS. Responsible for monitoring student performance data in all areas of the school.
Samler, Carmela	Instructional Coach	Oversee the 4 reading teachers at DMS. Oversee the reading program at DMS. Responsible for monitoring student reading data and progress monitoring data via I-Ready for DMS.
Smallridge, Delbert	Principal	Oversee the entire instructional program at DMS. Responsible for hiring all faculty and staff members and evaluating the teachers at DMS.
Peluffo, Evelyn	School Counselor	Oversee the school guidance program. Also responsible for the students with last names M-Z as their guidance counselor. Responsible for scheduling new students and dealing with students in a crisis situations. Also responsible for counseling our 3 AVID cohorts.
Mottl, Joseph	Dean	The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families
Kirschenpfad, Jamison	Instructional Coach	Oversee the Math teachers and Math program at DMS. Responsible for monitoring student Math data and progress monitoring data via I-Ready for DMS.
Flood, Christina	School Counselor	Oversee the school guidance program. Also responsible for the students with last names M-Z as their guidance counselor. Responsible for scheduling new students and dealing with students in a crisis situations. Also responsible for counseling our 3 AVID cohorts.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/3/2012, William Mcateer

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

4

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

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	206	231	223	0	0	0	0	660
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	97	75	0	0	0	0	259
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	13	17	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	25	15	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	17	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	52	56	0	0	0	0	139
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	73	53	0	0	0	0	163

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	86	63	52	0	0	0	0	201

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	8	7	22	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/17/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	209	215	0	0	0	0	656
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	41	50	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	30	44	0	0	0	0	97
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	18	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	71	67	0	0	0	0	226

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	70	68	99	0	0	0	0	237

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	0	17	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	209	215	0	0	0	0	656
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	41	50	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	30	44	0	0	0	0	97
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	18	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	71	67	0	0	0	0	226

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	70	68	99	0	0	0	0	237

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	0	17	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	49%	54%	44%	45%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	54%	54%	52%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	46%	47%	41%	36%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	55%	54%	58%	53%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	58%	57%	62%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	50%	51%	53%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	39%	46%	51%	44%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	70%	72%	63%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	44%	45%	-1%	54%	-10%
	2018	40%	44%	-4%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	46%	-4%	52%	-10%
	2018	41%	43%	-2%	51%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	55%	50%	5%	56%	-1%
	2018	53%	49%	4%	58%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	46%	2%	55%	-7%
	2018	46%	42%	4%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	49%	5%	54%	0%
	2018	61%	49%	12%	54%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	41%	41%	0%	46%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	43%	2%	45%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	40%	44%	-4%	48%	-8%
	2018	47%	46%	1%	50%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	65%	-4%	71%	-10%
2018	62%	64%	-2%	71%	-9%
Compare		-1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	54%	42%	61%	35%
2018	100%	57%	43%	62%	38%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	28	26	19	37	43		37			
ELL	19	34	30	31	54	53	4	25			
BLK	24	47	38	34	61	63		58			
HSP	41	50	37	49	60	56	25	60	67		
MUL	39	52		35	50		20				
WHT	55	60	52	62	63	48	52	70	58		
FRL	45	56	45	53	61	53	34	60	55		
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		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	46
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	52
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	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The lowest performance component was Science. We had a 39% proficiency rate. This was mostly due to having one of our two 8th grade science teachers out on medical leave for a large portion of the school year. The school was on an upward trend the previous year from 44 to 48 percent proficiency. This should not be an issue moving forward.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year was science. Again, for the reasons listed above we dropped 9 points in science (48% to 39%). This should not be an issue moving forward.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap when compared to the state average was science. Our proficiency level was 39% when the state average was 51%. The same factors listed in items "a" and "b" above contributed to the gap.

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

Our greatest gains came in ELA Learning Gains. We improved from 50 to 55% posted learning gains. Our school participated in a Pilot program with AVID. We started teaching our staff members how to implement WICOR teaching strategies. We will continue with expanding our teacher training for AVID and WICOR strategies during the summer of 2019 and throughout the school year.

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

The greatest area of concern from the EWS data is attendance. We have 20.9% of our students with an attendance rate below 90%. This is fairly even across all three grade levels. This poor level of attendance will significantly impact the school's performance on state tests. As well as the individual learning for these 136 students.

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

1. Continue to offer Intensive Math to all level 1 and 2 students in grades 6-8. Continue to reduce class sizes in general math classes in grades 6-8. These actions will increase proficiency and learning gains in math.
2. Provide Tutoring opportunities beyond the regular school day for students in the 3 subgroups that scored below 41% on the federal point index. (SWD, Multiracial, and ELL).
3. Provide additional training for our teachers in WICOR strategies associated with AVID.
4. Reduce the percentage of students with less than a 90% attendance rate by 6%.5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If we can offer additional instructional time in mathematics addressing missing skills, then student learning will increase. The intensive math class will be a separate math class in addition to the required math class. The focus will be on identifying missing skills and remediating the deficiencies. We will offer this class in a face-to-face AND online version.

Measurable Outcome: If we continue to offer Intensive Math to all level 1 and 2 students in grades 6-8, and continue to reduce the class size in general math classes in grades 6-8, then student learning will increase.

Our goal is to increase learning gains from 61% to 69% and to increase math proficiency from 55% to 58%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We are taking the same approach that the FDOE takes with turnaround schools...by adding 108 days of before school instructional time. In this case we are adding instructional time for mathematics. We will utilize certified math instructors to provide small group instruction, whole group instruction and at times individualized instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Dunnellon Middle School has shown significant progress in mathematics performance over the past 5 years. For the past 5 years DMS has had in place an Intensive Math program serving all level 1 and 2 students. Our scores have generally improved over time to the point that in 2018 we had the highest learning gains in math out of all middle schools in our district. And the second highest learning gains in the district for math (bottom 25%). We have seen first hand the results of our program over time and we plan to continue our intensive math program to keep math as one of our strengths at DMS.

Action Steps to Implement

Allocate Title I funds to provide 2 additional math teachers for DMS.

Person Responsible: Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

Build the appropriate number of sections of Intensive Math into the master schedule.

Person Responsible: Donna Durden (donna.durden@marion.k12.fl.us)

Schedule all level 1 and 2 students into Intensive Math.

Person Responsible: Donna Durden (donna.durden@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will take the approach that FDOE takes with turnaround schools. That is, increase instructional time. By offering 108 days of before school tutoring we will be able to assist students in ELA and Math to increase student learning.

Measurable Outcome: If we provide Tutoring opportunities beyond the school day for struggling students in ELA and Math, while targeting the 3 subgroups that scored below 41% on the federal point index, then student learning will increase.
Our goal is to have all 3 subgroups (ELL, SWD, & multiracial) scoring above 41% on the federal point index at the end of 20-21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: As stated above, we will offer additional instructional time to all students in the 3 underperforming subgroups via before and after school tutoring. We will hire certified teachers to assist students with ELA and Math on a daily basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increasing instructional time can only help students improve academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Allocate Title I funds to provide 108 days of before school tutoring.

Person Responsible Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

Identify the individual students within the 3 subgroups.

Person Responsible Evelyn Peluffo (evelyn.peluffo@marion.k12.fl.us)

Set up a tutoring schedule for DMS. Identify teachers to tutor.

Person Responsible Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

Invite students who are targeted to participate in tutoring.

Person Responsible Evelyn Peluffo (evelyn.peluffo@marion.k12.fl.us)

Implement program by interim report time for quarter 1.

Person Responsible Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Continue to teach WICOR teaching strategies to all teachers. Incorporating WICOR teaching strategies into daily lessons will increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

If teachers in core areas incorporate WICOR teaching strategies into their lessons, then student learning will increase by 5% in ELA and Math proficiency.

ELA from 48% to 53%
Math from 55% to 60%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmela Samler (carmela.samler@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

DMS is a newly appointed AVID school. We have sent three groups of teachers to the AVID summer institutes during the past three summers. As our teachers learn more WICOR strategies students will be more engaged in their lessons and student learning will increase.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

As mentioned previously, DMS is a newly appointed AVID school. We are one of only two AVID schools in our district. AVID is a system that is well known throughout the nation. South Sumter Middle School is a National Demonstration School for AVID. They have been on this journey for over 9 years. The school has seen a steady increase in student achievement in ELA and math over the past 9 years. We expect to see similar results.

Action Steps to Implement

Assign groups of teachers to attend AVID summer institutes.

Person

Responsible Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

Have department chairs become AVID trained.

Person

Responsible Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

Structure department meetings to include WICOR training for all department members every two weeks.

Person

Responsible Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

Have AVID coordinator and Math CAS provide WICOR training on early release days to faculty.

Person

Responsible Carmela Samler (carmela.samler@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor the use of WICOR strategies throughout all classrooms at DMS.

Person

Responsible Delbert Smallridge (delbert.smallridge@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will address the poor attendance rate issue by tying attendance requirements to all extra curricular activities. There will be attendance requirements for all field trips, ROAR reward parties, formal dances and athletic teams. We will continue to have Child Study Team meetings to address attendance concerns for specific students as well provide Public Service Announcements via our newsletter re: the importance of regular school attendance.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
- Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00