

Dixie District Schools

Ruth Rains Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Ruth Rains Middle School

981 SE 351 HWY, Cross City, FL 32628

<http://www.dixie.k12.fl.us>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of RRMS is to instill in our students the skills that will enable them to become productive citizens in a global society. The RRMS staff will model these skills in a positive way, and always pursue what's best for each and every student. We will continue to enhance the culture and atmosphere here at RRMS, and work together to make great things possible for our students and staff.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ruth Rains Middle School is dedicated to the education of the total child. RRMS, in partnership with families and community, will provide relevant educational opportunities and maintain high academic expectations for the diverse community of learners within our school.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Martin, Jamie	Principal	Jamie Martin is the principal. He is also a member of the RRMS SAC team. He leads meetings with leadership teams to review progress towards the goals of the school and provides input to the RRMS School Improvement Plan.
Lord, Chasity	Assistant Principal	Chasity Lord is the Assistant Principal. She attends SAC meetings and other department meetings. She also provides input to RRMS School Improvement Plan.
Kight, April	Reading Coach	April Kight is the instructional/ reading coach. She is a member of the SAC team. She attends school department meetings, provides input in the School Improvement Plan, as well as assists with writing the SIP. She also leads the departments in professional development.
Lundy, Erin	School Counselor	Erin Lundy is the guidance counselor. She meets with teachers and students to monitor all student progress within the school. She attends SAC meetings and provides input to the SIP.
Driggers, Jean	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Driggers is the 7th grade & advanced math teacher. She attends SAC meetings and provides input to the SIP.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council(SAC), School Literacy Leadership Team(SLLT), Leadership Team, and District staff were ALL stakeholders with input in the SIP process.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Regular monitoring for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap will be done through STAR, APM, and RTI.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 5-7
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	16%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	38	1	59	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	13	43	58	0	114
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	28	56	54	0	138
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	41	40	0	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	28	56	54	0	138
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	21	29	58	0	108

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	12

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	44	10	85	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	19	30	43	0	92
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	2	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	24	35	35	0	94
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	46	41	0	101
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	64	67	75	0	206

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	40	0	65

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	10	0	25

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	44	10	85	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	19	30	43	0	92
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	2	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	24	35	35	0	94
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	46	41	0	101
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	64	67	75	0	206

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	40	0	65

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	10	0	25

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	36		49	44		50	49		
ELA Learning Gains				37			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			37		
Math Achievement*	50		56	52		36	48		
Math Learning Gains				40			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34			34		
Science Achievement*	47		49	37		53	51		
Social Studies Achievement*	73		68	77		58	74		
Middle School Acceleration			73			49	83		
Graduation Rate						49			
College and Career Acceleration						70			
ELP Progress			40			76			

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	206
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	351
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	4	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	1	1
HSP	50			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	53			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	45			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	36			50			47	73				
SWD	28			35			35	50			4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	13			25			24				3	
HSP	31			69							2	
MUL	53			60							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	38			51			51	72			4	
FRL	33			45			45	72			4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	44	37	30	52	40	34	37	77				
SWD	20	28	32	23	27	24	32	43				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	19		29	54	40		79				
HSP	44	27		69	40							
MUL	47	47		47	40							
PAC												
WHT	45	38	31	52	39	33	36	77				
FRL	38	33	29	46	35	33	30	69				

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	49	48	37	48	37	34	51	74	83			
SWD	29	43	32	20	29	18	30	41				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	48	42	41	37	50						
HSP	50	44		44	17			60				
MUL	57	46		43	31							
PAC												
WHT	50	47	38	49	38	35	51	74	81			
FRL	43	45	28	41	34	33	47	68	84			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	35%	35%	0%	54%	-19%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	38%	0%	47%	-9%
06	2023 - Spring	33%	33%	0%	47%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	43%	43%	0%	54%	-11%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	41%	0%	48%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	95%	51%	44%	55%	40%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	45%	0%	51%	-6%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	69%	0%	66%	3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

2023 EOY FAST ELA data showed that 64% of students in 5th grade, 67% of students in 6th grade, and 62% of students of 7th grade were performing below a level 3. The overall contributing factor that led to this performance is overall absenteeism, which continues to decline.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was ELA proficiency in 5th grade. 5th grade went from 46% proficient to 39% proficient, which was a decrease of 7%.

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 data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 5th grade ELA of 35% compared to the state average of 55%, which was 20% below state average. The overall contributing factor that led to this performance is overall absenteeism, which continues to continuing decline.

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

7th grade advanced math showed the greatest improvement exceeding the state average of 55% by 41% with 96% of students proficient. Specific instructional strategies to learn content and co-teaching with two teachers who provided the instruction. They shared lesson plans, modeled for one another, and other professional development when needed.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two potential areas of concern are attendance and school suspensions.

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

- improve ELA proficiency to 50% or above
- attendance-
- decrease students out of school suspensions

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The most recent ESSA data indicates an FPPI of 29% for SWD's. This is the third year for SWD's falling below 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the FPPI of SWD's from 29% to 41%.

Monitoring:

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

- Leadership team will meet monthly to review trends noticed during walkthroughs and adjust as needed.
- RTI data will be monitored and assessed at monthly RTI meetings to ensure that students are making appropriate learning gains.
- PM data will be monitored 3 times per year to ensure students are growing and mastering grade level benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

By increasing the understanding and use of five high level instructional practices from the FL B.E.S.T. ELA Practice Profiles(explicit instruction, systematic instruction, differentiated instruction, scaffolded instruction, and corrective feedback) as they specifically relate to the benchmark aligned instruction we will increase student proficiency on EOY state FAST ELA assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These five high leverage practices have the following evidence to support their use:

Explicit = strong evidence

Systematic= strong evidence

Scaffolded=promising evidence

Corrective Feedback= promising evidence

Differentiated instruction=strong evidence

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

-Coaches will provide coaching cycles to assist teachers in implementation of high leverage instructional practices

-Instructional coaches will facilitate weekly grade level planning and provide support on how to develop benchmark aligned lessons.

-Leadership regularly shares assessment dates, professional learning sessions and data meetings.

Person Responsible: Chasity Lord (chasitylord@dixie.k12.fl.us)

By When: -on going

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The most recent ESSA data indicates an FPPI of 39% for FRL's. This is the first year for FRL's falling below 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the FPPI of FRL's from 39% to 45%

Monitoring:

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

- Leadership team will meet monthly to review trends noticed during walkthroughs and adjust as needed.
- RTI data will be monitored and assessed at monthly RTI meetings to ensure that students are making appropriate learning gains.
- PM data will be monitored 3 times per year to ensure students are growing and mastering grade level benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

By increasing the understanding and use of five high level instructional practices from the FL BEST ELA Practice Profiles (explicit instruction, systematic instruction, differentiated instruction, scaffolded instruction, and corrective feedback) as they specifically relate to the benchmark aligned instruction we will increase student proficiency on EOY state FAST ELA assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These five high leverage practices have the following evidence to support their use:

Explicit=strong

Systematic= strong

Scaffolded=promising

Corrective Feedback= promising

Differentiated Instruction= strong

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

- Coaches will provide coaching cycles to assist teachers in implementation of high leverage instructional practices

-Instructional coaches will facilitate weekly grade level planning and provide support on how to develop benchmark aligned lessons.

-Leadership regularly shares assessment dates, professional learning sessions and data meetings.

Person Responsible: Chasity Lord (chasitylord@dixie.k12.fl.us)

By When: on going

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Attendance was identified as a crucial need from the EWS data. According to our Skyward report, 98 students in grades 5 - 7 had attendance below 90%. We can not help kids improve in school if they aren't actually coming to school. If we work to create a more positive culture and environment in school, students will be more likely to attend. Once we have them attending more regularly we can actually help them learn and grow academically, and hopefully help them become lifelong learners.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to reduce the number of students in grades 5-7 with attendance below 90% from 98 students to 75 students.

Monitoring:

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

EWS data will monitored three times per year for changes with attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Create partnerships to support school, family, and community involvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates that implementing the intervention of creating partnerships to support school, family, and community involvement meets the definition of level 3 promising evidence.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Provide attendance awards

Person Responsible: April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

By When: Each 9 weeks and EOY

Share attendance data with students and teachers

Person Responsible: April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly reports

Start a campaign to share the benefits of attendance during morning announcements and lunch.

Person Responsible: Jean Driggers (jeandrillers@dixie.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Through the use of money from SAC, Title 1, and other federal grants, we are using evidenced-based resources to make changes to our overall school improvement. Some of those include:

- Achieve 3000(Tier 1 & Tier 2 students)
- IXL(Tier 1, 2, and 3 students)
- Reading Horizons(Tier 2 & Tier 3 students)
- TCM(Tier 2 & Tier 3 students)

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

N/A

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

The percentage of 5th grade students scoring below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment was 64%.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We will decrease the percentage of 5th grade students scoring below proficiency on the Spring 24 FAST ELA assessment from 64% to 45%.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

- Leadership team will meet monthly to review trends noticed during walkthroughs and adjust as needed.
- RTI data will be monitored and assessed at monthly RTI meetings to ensure that students are making appropriate learning gains.
- PM data will be monitored 3 times per year to ensure students are growing and mastering grade level benchmarks.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Kight, April, aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

As a result of increased understanding and use of five high level practice profiles from the FL B.E.S.T. ELA Practice Profiles (explicit instruction, systematic instruction, differentiated instruction, scaffolded instruction, and corrective feedback) as they specifically relate to benchmark aligned instruction, students performing below proficiency will decrease.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The following -based practices/ programs that align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan and the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards will be incorporated in ELA instruction:

- Explicit Instruction- strong evidence
- Systematic Instruction-strong evidence
- Scaffolded Instruction- promising evidence
- Corrective Feedback- promising evidence
- Differentiated Instruction- strong evidence

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
-Coaches will provide coaching cycles to assist teachers in implementation of high leverage instructional practices -Instructional coaches will facilitate weekly grade level planning and provide support on how to develop benchmark aligned lessons. -Leadership regularly shares assessment dates, professional learning sessions and data meetings.	Lord, Chasity, chasitylord@dixie.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We will hold a SAC meeting and review SIP with committee members and visitors. We will have a copy available for review in the front office. A copy will also be posted on the school website and the district website.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

- parent/teacher conference night
- school-wide communication device (REMIND or Class DoJo)
- Facebook
- school & district webpage
- monthly school newsletters
- progress reports and report cards
- Skyward family access accounts

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

- extra support for teachers through PLC's
- NEFEC support with strategic planning
- weekly walkthroughs with corrective feedback
- coaching cycles
- coach works with teachers in lesson planning and provides professional learning during PLC's
- professional learning

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Wellness Wednesdays and Base-Ed program referral from guidance counselor.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Grades 6 and 7 will be using XELLO for early career planning opportunities.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

- Base Ed Program (internal & BAM)
- Standing Up for Me curriculum (self-contained classroom)
- Track behaviors with ABC Data Sheets for students with IEP's/ 504's for FBA/BIPS.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

- NEFEC's PLCP
- NEFEC's New Teacher Network
- RRMS school mentor
- coach provided professional learning
- professional learning provided by Equitable Literacy

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A