

Marion County Public Schools

Dunnellon Elementary School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 6/21/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	44%

School Grades History

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

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
Tarantino, Matthew	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
Martinez, Gloria	Dean	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.
Boshela, Brenda	Reading Coach	Literacy CAS is the lead for professional development in the area of 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/21/2022, Karen English

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

534

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

9

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	92	90	82	95	80	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	26	31	17	25	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	6	3	3	2	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	10	21	32	30	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
Course failure in Math	7	15	32	24	14	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	18	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	9	19	26	20	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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

Tuesday 8/2/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	46%	56%				50%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						54%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						62%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	51%	50%	50%				59%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%						60%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						50%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	53%	59%				43%	47%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	52%	44%	8%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	49%	4%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	70%	49%	21%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	45%	-1%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	44%	-3%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	13	38	38	13	41	35	13				
ELL	37	57	50	38	35	27					
BLK	29	43		19	54						
HSP	47	68	62	52	56	31	27				
MUL	27			50							
WHT	56	59	50	55	61	43	54				
FRL	38	53	48	42	52	41	32				
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							
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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	54
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

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

Our ELA 2022 proficiency is at the same level (50%) as it was in 2019. We had a slight decrease to 49% in 2021.

ELA Learning Gains this year are at 60%. In 2019 LG were 52% and in 2018 were were at 54%.

ELA Learning Gains-Lowest Quartile was at 52% this year which was a 4% increase over 2021 but 10% lower than 2019.

Looking at trends in ELA over a three-year period indicates that there has been a increase in the percent of students making learning gains. ELA Learning Gains-Lowest 25% has not been consistent in the percent making gains.

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 increased by 4% to 51%, which is still 8% lower than our proficiency rate in 2019.

Math Learning Gains are higher than they were in 2021 with a 6% increase but still 2% lower than 2019.

Our Lowest Quartile Learning Gains are at 45%, which is 1% lower than in 2021 (46%); and lower than in 2019 when we were at 50%.

Our Science proficiency level is at 45%, which is down from 48% in 2021 however, our proficiency rate in 2019 was 43%.

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

FSA ELA - 3rd and 5th Grade show a need for improvement in the area of ELA. 3rd Grade proficiency dropped 7% and 5th grade dropped 3%.

FSA Math - 5th Grade shows a need for improvement in the area of Math. 5th grade proficiency dropped 19% .

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

Tier 1 instruction continues to be an area of focus for improvement. In order to address this area of improvement, during our twice weekly collaborative planning meetings our focus will be on high yield instructional practices and the delivery of instruction that is aligned with the B.E.S.T Benchmarks in ELA and Math. An emphasis will also be placed on tracking formative assessment data to drive lesson plans and re-teaching opportunities.

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

The 2022 FSA assessment indicated that our 4th Grade ELA and Math showed the most improvement. While our over all ELA Proficiency rate is 50% we were able to increase our learning gains in both ELA and Math. ELA Learning Gains are at 60% and ELA Learning Gains for our Lowest 25% was 52%. Our Math Learning Gains was at 58%.

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 the next steps for students based on the data.

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

During collaborative planning sessions we will need to make sure our time is spent on planning for effective Tier 1 instruction. In ELA, Kindergarten-5th grade will need to make sure the B.E.S.T Benchmarks are being addressed and that when planning we plan lessons using the gradual release model to ensure students are supported through the learning process. In Math, K-5 will have to learn about the B.E.S.T Benchmarks and when planning make sure the new Math curriculum is supporting/aligning with the new benchmarks.

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 benchmarks. In addition, we will provide professional development in examining/evaluating student work samples in view of the level of rigor required by the 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. A focus on the CPA Model in math (Concrete-Pictorial-Abstract) will be a focus.

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 invite our District ELA Content Specialist to work with our grade level teams at least 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 on planning for effective Tier 1 instruction using high yield strategies. 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.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

K-2 end of year iReady ELA AP3 Data indicates the following: Kindergarten 51% proficient, 1st Grade 24% proficient and 2nd Grade 36% proficient.
 In K-2 end of year iReady Math AP3 Data indicates the following: Kindergarten 64% proficient, 1st Grade 29% proficient, and 2nd Grade 19% proficient.
 FSA ELA - 3rd and 5th Grade show a need for improvement in the area of ELA. 3rd Grade proficiency dropped 7% and 5th grade dropped 3%. FSA ELA - 4th Grade 60% of our students were proficient
 FSA Math - 5th Grade shows a need for improvement in the area of Math. 5th grade proficiency dropped 19% while our 4th Grade results indicate that 60% of the students in that grade level are proficient.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Results from the new State Assessment (F.A.S.T) will be used to monitor progress from assessment window to assessment window.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:
 The assessment listed below will be administered three times during the school year.
 Star Early Literacy - VPK-1
 Star Reading - 1-2
 Star Mathematics – K-2
 F.A.S.T - (Cambium Assessment) 3-5 in ELA and Math

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

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

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)

K-5 teachers will collaborate each week to plan math instruction that is aligned to the benchmark. A special focus will be on providing math instruction that follows the CPA model (concrete-pictorial-abstract). Formative assessment data will be collected to provide information for next steps in planning for instruction that supports student mastery of the grade level benchmarks in mathematics.

Person Responsible Matthew Tarantino (matthew.tarantino@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our 5th Grade Science results have been inconsistent over the past three years. In 2019 we had 43% proficiency, in 2021 we had 48%, and in 2022 we had a 45% proficiency rate.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

On our 5th Grade State Science Assessment we will increase our proficiency rate to at least 50%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The District Progress Monitoring Assessments (DPMA) will be used to monitor student growth in mastering grade level science standards in grades 3-5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Tarantino (matthew.tarantino@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The 5 E's of Science Engagement will be used in grades K-5 in order to support student engagement and a deeper understanding of grade level science content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The 5 E's of Science Engagement is a proven research based strategy that encompasses hands on learning in Science and builds critical thinking skills.

Action Steps to Implement

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

This year we will have a K-2 Science Lab and a 3-5 Science Lab for grade levels. This will allow us to provide hands-on experience that will promote student engagement and the mastery of grade level science concepts.

Person Responsible

Matthew Tarantino (matthew.tarantino@marion.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

iReady AP3 results - Kindergarten 51% proficient with 49% one year below grade level
1st Grade 24% proficient with 76% one year below grade level
2nd Grade 36% proficient, 52% one year below grade level, with 12% more than one grade level below

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our FSA ELA data shows there is a critical need in 3rd grade (39% proficiency), and 5th Grade (49% proficiency). Our 4th Grade FSA ELA data shows 60% of our 4th Grade students are proficient.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

iReady AP3 results - Kindergarten 51% proficient with 49% one year below grade level
1st Grade 24% proficient with 76% one year below grade level
2nd Grade 36% proficient, 52% one year below grade level, with 12% more than one grade level below

The rate of proficiency in 1st grade will increase to at least 40% and in 2nd grade the rate of proficiency will increase to at least 40%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

FSA ELA - 3rd and 5th Grade show a need for improvement in the area of ELA. 3rd Grade proficiency dropped 7% and 5th grade dropped 3%. At the end of the year 3rd Grade proficiency will rate will increase by 5% and 5th Grade Proficiency will be at least 50%.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Our area of focus - Instructional Practices relating to B.E.S.T will be monitored through the collection of formative assessment data and the data review from State Testing results (F.A.S.T) and District Progress Monitoring Assessments (DPMA).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Tarantino, Matthew, matthew.tarantino@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Students who are in need of intervention in reading will be placed into an intervention that address their specific area of need. Programs used during the MTSS block are: S.I.P.P. (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words, Heggerty for Phonological Awareness, Language Power (Oral Language), Read Naturally, Lexia Core 5, or Read 180.

In addition, we will utilize one of Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies (scaffolding which 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Each of the above intervention materials addresses areas of specific needs and students are placed in those programs based on their need.

The programs were selected by MCPS because they have shown to be effective for the targeted population.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
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. Literacy Coaching and Professional Learning will be part of this action step. During our Literacy Leadership meetings data will be reviewed to determine professional development needs.	Tarantino, Matthew, matthew.tarantino@marion.k12.fl.us
On-going student data from formative assessments and in program assessments for our intervention groups will be monitored for student progress. The data will be used to determine next steps for students within the intervention programs and to identify students who may need a change in placement within our MTSS intervention materials. On-going review of assessments will be part of this action step.	Boshela, Brenda, brenda.boshela@marion.k12.fl.us

Positive Culture & Environment

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

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 will reach 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 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 strive to bolster our community relationships by taking part in the Reading Pals program through United Way. Furthermore, we are in the process of working with 100 Grandparents group to come to read with students in every classroom at our school each month. 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 school culture and environment.

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

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

Matthew Tarantino - Assistant Principal - Oversees the facilitation of a positive culture and environment for faculty and staff at our school.

Karen 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.