

Marion County Public Schools

Dunnellon Elementary School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Dunnellon Elementary School

10235 SW 180TH AVENUE RD, Dunnellon, FL 34432

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Karen English

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Dunnellon Elementary School

10235 SW 180TH AVENUE RD, Dunnellon, FL 34432

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	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.

The Dunnellon Elementary School community is committed to providing a safe, stimulating, and challenging learning environment that meets the needs of all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dunnellon Elementary School strives to create an environment where all children, regardless of differences, will be able to succeed academically, physically, and emotionally to their maximum potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
English, Karen	Principal	Principal will develop a continuum of intervention supports for both behavior and academic, which are readily accessible as soon as a student is indicated as at risk or off track. Develop effective intervention plans and provide prevention supports, which act to prevent students from becoming disengaged or developing skills deficits. They will analyze data to make changes that will increase student achievement.
Savage, Alyson	School Counselor	School counselor is in charge of implementing the Social Emotional Learning program at the school and supporting the MTSS process for behavior and academics schoolwide. The counselor communicates with parents about attendance and runs meetings to discuss absences and tardies with the support of the school social worker and assistant principal.
Forst, Bethany	Other	Literacy CAS is the lead for professional development with the teaching-learning cycle and guided reading as well as assisting with other curriculum-based professional development throughout the school year. She is also involved in the SAC committee and assisting with planning Parent and Family Engagement Activities.
Benson, Kathryn	Assistant Principal	Work with principal and content area specialists to develop a continuum of intervention supports for both behavior and academics, which are readily accessible as soon as a student is indicated as at risk or off track. Develop effective intervention plans and provide prevention supports which act to prevent students from becoming disengaged or developing skills deficits. They will analyze data to make changes that will increase student achievement.
Hudoff, Jonathan	Other	The dean is in charge of discipline and assisting with the implementation of the Social Emotional Learning program at the school. He also assists with the Parent and Family Engagement Plan and its implementation. Part of the discipline role is working with teachers and students to assist them in decreasing behavioral problems in the classroom to decrease the loss of instructional time due to misbehaviors.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/12/2021, Karen English

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.*

3

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

529

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

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

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	89	72	82	98	109	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	27	23	28	41	37	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	6	4	3	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	11	15	32	22	33	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Course failure in Math	7	12	30	19	50	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	12	12	29	22	42	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	1	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	64	78	78	94	114	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	0	38	34	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	7	13	13	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	3	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	64	78	78	94	114	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	0	38	34	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	7	13	13	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	3	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				50%	47%	57%	49%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	56%	58%	40%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	52%	53%	30%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	51%	63%	52%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	58%	62%	41%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	49%	51%	25%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	47%	53%	52%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	52%	44%	8%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	49%	4%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	70%	49%	21%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	45%	-1%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	44%	-3%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Mathematics, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15 / 23%	12 / 17%	31 / 44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 26%	8 / 18%	15 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 9%	0 / 0%	3 / 27%
	English Language Learners	1 / 33%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7 / 11%	11 / 16%	27 / 38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 17%	5 / 11%	14 / 31%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 9%	1 / 9%	3 / 27%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11 / 15%	17 / 21%	24 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 14%	9 / 15%	12 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 8%	1 / 8%	1 / 8%
	English Language Learners	1 / 14%	1 / 14%	1 / 14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6 / 8%	8 / 10%	13 / 16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 / 3%	3 / 5%	6 / 10%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 8%	1 / 8%
	English Language Learners	1 / 14%	1 / 14%	1 / 14%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41 / 45%	34 / 36%	41 / 42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 / 35%	16 / 26%	21 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	2 / 12%	5 / 29%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13 / 14%	12 / 13%	23 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 10%	6 / 10%	9 / 15%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 6%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29 / 30%	22 / 21%	31 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18 / 27%	12 / 16%	18 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 13%	2 / 13%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9 / 9%	7 / 7%	31 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 6%	6 / 8%	18 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29 / 31%	13 / 13%	20 / 20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18 / 32%	8 / 14%	10 / 17%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25 / 27%	15 / 15%	29 / 28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 27%	8 / 13%	21 / 35%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 6%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49 / 54%	40 / 41%	33 / 34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26 / 49%	21 / 37%	19 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 14%	2 / 12%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 50%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	10	17	25	18	44						
ELL	9	21		19	46						
BLK	32			11							
HSP	32	33	45	41	60	55	32				
MUL	30										
WHT	59	61	40	54	52		58				
FRL	42	48	56	39	53	47	48				
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	21	32	55	32	54	50					
ELL	11	38		54	70		8				
BLK	8			27							

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
HSP	30	42	64	51	55	40	28				
MUL	54			46							
WHT	61	60	67	65	65	57	51				
FRL	43	52	67	54	55	52	31				
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	21	30	27	19	33	33	23				
ELL	23	40	31	40	42	18					
BLK	24	29	20	6	7						
HSP	36	40	41	41	47	40	38				
WHT	55	40	21	61	43	19	58				
FRL	41	40	29	44	35	18	47				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	25
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	24
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	22
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	30
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

FSA ELA Achievement levels over three (3) years indicate the following:

Our ELA 2021 proficiency is at the same level (49%) as it was in 2018. We had a slight increase to 50% in 2019.

ELA Learning Gains were at 40% in 2018 and increased to 54% in 2019, and in 2021, we are now at 52%.

ELA Lowest Quartile was significantly lower than the State in 2018 (30%), and in 2019, we were significantly higher than the State with LQ 62%. Our LQ gains are now at 48% for 2021.

Looking at trends in ELA over a three-year period indicates that there has been a decline in learning gains for our lowest quartile students. In addition, three of our Federal Index Sub-Groups show proficiency levels well below our school average: Black students (8%), ELL students (11%), and SWD (21%).

FSA Math Achievement levels over three (3) years indicate the following:

Our overall Math Proficiency has decreased to 47%, which is our lowest in the three-year period.

Math Learning Gains are lower than they were in 2019; however, they are higher than they were in 2018.

Our Lowest Quartile Learning Gains are at 46%, which is lower than in 2019; however, this is significantly higher than in 2018, when gains were at 25%. Overall, our Math achievement is showing a decline.

Our Science proficiency level is at 46%, which is up from 41%; however, our proficiency rate in 2017 was at 53%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

3rd and 4th Grade show a need for improvement in the area of ELA. 3rd Grade proficiency dropped 6% and 4th grade dropped 8%.

3rd and 4th Grade show a need for improvement in the area of Math. 3rd grade proficiency dropped 33% while 4th grade dropped 5%

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

Our Tier 1 instruction is an area in need of improvement in both ELA and Math. In prior years we have met once a week with grade level teams for collaborative planning. This year we will meet twice weekly with teams to plan for Tier 1 instruction with a greater focus on the planning of lessons that are aligned with the B.E.S.T Benchmarks and FSA Standards.

ELA - Training in the following areas will be provided through-out the year: Close Reading, phonics, vocabulary, and fluency development. During grade level collaborative planning sequencing of the standards/benchmarks will be done with the assistance of our Literacy Content Area Specialist.

Math - Our District Math person will be asked to assist grade level teams in sequencing the quarterly math standards so that the skills being taught during each quarter build upon each other to support student mastery of the standards/benchmarks.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

5th Grade ELA showed a 9% increase in proficiency, and Math FSA data showed a 12% increase in proficiency from 2019 to 2021.

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

Teachers met weekly to discuss data, look at learning goals and checks for understanding to align lessons to the standards. There was also a focus on collecting formative assessment data and to have discussions about the data to make decisions for next steps for students based on the data.

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

During collaborative planning teachers will review the standards and learning goals in order to ensure they are planning lessons that address the rigor of the standard/benchmark. We will increase engagement strategies that are embedded in our Gradual Release model.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Development for our staff will include a targeted focus on depth of knowledge and how to align student learning opportunities/activities to the rigor of the standard. In addition, we will provide professional development in examining/evaluating student work samples in view of the level of rigor required by the standard/benchmark. Based on this analysis we will provide support for teachers in making instructional adjustments to achieve an appropriate level of rigor in student assignments. Furthermore, we will provide professional development that helps teachers identify best practices with engagement strategies, such as Kagan Structures that will increase student interaction in the learning process.

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

We will invite our District Math Content Specialist to work with our grade level math teachers once a month.

We will continue to focus on Tier I instruction looking at data to drive instruction.

Collaboration meetings will be focused and targeted for the greatest impact for our teachers in reading and in math. The administration team will complete weekly walkthroughs looking for trends to continue to monitor improvement. Walkthrough forms will be kept in Google forms where leadership can assess trends by grade levels and see how teachers are progressing in their instructional practice. Targeted feedback is provided to teachers looking for high yield instructional strategies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA FSA data over the last three years indicates a decline in proficiency with same grade comparison. Our Math FSA data over the last three years indicates a 9% decline in proficiency with same grade comparison.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2021 ELA FSA, 46% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 45% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 52% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA , 51% of 3rd grade, 50% of 4th grade, and 57% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher. On the 2021 Math FSA, 37% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 44% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 56% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA , 42% of 3rd grade, 49% of 4th grade, and 61% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher.
Monitoring:	In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress: K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2021, AP2 January 2022, and AP3 May 2022 K-5: i-Ready Growth Monitoring November 2021 and March 2022 3-5: District QSMAs Q1 October 2021, Q2 December 2021, Q3 March 2022 3-5: 2022 FSA Math Proficiency Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. During classroom walk throughs levels of student engagement will be noted by administration and feedback will be provided to teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathryn Benson (kathryn.benson@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus will primarily be scaffolding, as it is a high-yield strategy with an effect size of 0.82.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "scaffolding has a 0.82 effect size. Typically the four steps include: I do, We do, You do together, and then You do alone. This scaffolds the learning process and supports students through guided practice.

Action Steps to Implement

Direct Instruction - Teachers will provide direct and explicit instruction through scaffolded instruction to empower students to become proficient with the skill of the standard.

Person Responsible Kathryn Benson (kathryn.benson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Scaffolding - Teachers will scaffold through direct instruction the requisite background knowledge students need to be successful with the concepts espoused.

Person Responsible Kathryn Benson (kathryn.benson@marion.k12.fl.us)

Parent Engagement - We will provide parent engagement activities wherein we will specifically target the parents and families of students in ESSA subgroups performing below 41% at our school, namely African-American students, ESOL students, and students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Bethany Forst (bethany.forst@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our 2021 ELA progress monitoring data show the following percent of grades K-2 students not on track to secure a level 3 are 71 % of Kindergarten, 56% of 1st grade, 70% of 2nd grade.
Our 2021 ELA FSA data show the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3: 54% of 3rd grade, 55% of 4th grade, 48% of 5th grade.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2021 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement, 29% of our kindergarten students were proficient, 44% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 29% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. On the 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement 32% of kindergarten, 32% of 1st grade, and 32% of 2nd grade students will be proficient.
On the 2021 ELA FSA, 46% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 45% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 52% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA , 51% of 3rd grade, 50% of 4th grade, and 57% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher.

Monitoring: In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:
K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2021, AP2 January 2022, and AP3 May 2022
K-5: i-Ready Growth Monitoring November 2021 and March 2022
3-5: District QSMAs Q1 October 2021, Q2 December 2021, Q3 March 2022
Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.
During classroom walk throughs levels of student engagement will be noted by the administration and feedback will be provided to teachers

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karen English (karen.english@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Scaffolding: Teachers build support for students in learning and gradually take away supports as needed. Teachers model, offer feedback and coaching as students are learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "scaffolding has a 0.82 effect size". Typically, the four steps include: I do, We do, You do together, and then You do alone. This scaffolds the learning process and supports students through guided practice.

Action Steps to Implement

K-5 teachers will collaborate each week to plan phonics and vocabulary instruction and use of scaffolding reading strategies within the ELA block. Teachers should show evidence of scaffolding at the beginning of a learning task and as needed when students need support. Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure that ELA instruction is consistently administered with fidelity.

Person Responsible Karen English (karen.english@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

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.

Our school believes that promoting a positive school culture will increase student learning, encourage parental involvement, and strengthen community partnerships. We believe that the foundation for this positive school culture and environment begins before students even step foot onto campus. With this in mind, each of our teachers reached out to the parents of every student in their class during the week prior to school beginning in order to introduce themselves, welcome the students to a new school year, and ease the transition for students and their families into a new school year well equipped with information about what that would entail. Every morning of the school year, students are greeted by paraprofessionals, support staff, and administrative staff as they arrive to school. Next, they are welcomed into their classrooms by their teachers every morning as well to start the day in a positive manner. In addition to our robust Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) efforts, we have planned to hold quarterly celebrations for students who meet Accelerated Reader (AR) goals. We also will host monthly incentives for classes that meet AR goals. Moreover, we have a strong social-emotional learning (SEL) curriculum through the Caring School Community program to help bolster the positive, family-like environment we want to maintain on our campus. As a leadership team, we work diligently every day to strengthen the positive school culture and environment for our staff as well. We welcomed staff back to this school year with a goodie basket, we are currently undergoing our Teacher of the Year nominations process to recognize excellence on our campus, and we have several incentives and rewards built into this year for our staff as well. We also have encouraged staff to promote positive relationships amongst themselves as well, and we are working to strengthen positive professional partnerships through collaborative planning.

We have striven to bolster our community relationships by taking part in the Reading Pals program through United Way. Furthermore, we have 100 grandparents come to read with students in every classroom at our school each month; this will resume once volunteers are cleared to return to campus. Additionally, we are very proud of our new business partnership with Ocala Fiber Network; we anticipate strengthening this relationship throughout this school year by inviting their leadership to participate in School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings and to participate in school events hosted on campus this year.

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

Mr. Jonathan Hudoff - Student Services Manager - Oversees PBIS Initiatives to promote a positive culture and environment for students at our school

Ms. Alyson Savage - Guidance Counselor - Oversees SEL implementation and training to promote a positive culture and environment for our students and staff at our school

Ms. Kathryn Benson - Assistant Principal - Oversees the facilitation of a positive culture and environment for faculty and staff at our school

Ms. English - Principal - Oversees the overall implementation of strategies that promote a positive culture and environment for students, staff, and the community of Dunnellon Elementary School

All staff: Responsible to foster positive relationships with students and their families every day at school

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00