Dunbar Elementary Magnet School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Dunbar Elementary Magnet School

1730 W UNION ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

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.

To inspire students to be lifelong learners through authentic learning experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Providing each child with a prescription for SUCCESS.

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
Crim, Cynthia	Principal	Oversee SIP and SAC
Quintyne, Alexandra	Assistant Principal	Help principal oversee SIP and SAC chair

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 Leadership team meets to review student data from the previous year to determine the appropriate next steps of our instructional priorities. All staff members meet during pre-planning to review data and discuss instructional goals for the year.

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))

The Leadership team meets weekly to discuss the progress and action steps needed to accomplish our goals.

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)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	92%
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: D 2018-19: D 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	17	11	14	17	17	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	4	2	9	0	0	0	17
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	13	29	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	12	22	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	11	29	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	22	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	11	29	0	0	0	42

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	2	9	11	0	0	0	22

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

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	13	14	15	10	16	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	13	14	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	12	14	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	9	2	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	13	14	15	10	16	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	13	14	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	12	14	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	9	2	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	45	50	53	42	53	56	43		
ELA Learning Gains				46			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			46		
Math Achievement*	61	56	59	59	50	50	56		
Math Learning Gains				58			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			54		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	35	50	54	39	59	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		59	59				60		

* 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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	201
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	365
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	55			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	89			
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	36	Yes	2	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	60			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	50			

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	45			61			35					
SWD	38			29							2	
ELL	25			42							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			54			27				4	
HSP	53			62			50				3	
MUL	69			69							2	
PAC												
WHT	77			100							2	
FRL	43			59			33				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	42	46	58	59	58	63	39					
SWD	18	33		36	73		18					
ELL	43			50								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	42	63	52	56	67	26					
HSP	51	57		68	61		63					
MUL	62			69								
PAC												
WHT	40	36		60	55							
FRL	38	45	58	57	59	61	35					

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	43	60	46	56	45	54	48					60
SWD	35	55		39	45							
ELL	40			47								60

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	58	50	51	45		30					
HSP	58	62		64	46		73					
MUL	50			60								
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	41	62	46	56	48	54	47					

Table title: 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	54%	-6%	58%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	46%	14%	50%	10%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	92%	55%	37%	59%	33%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	59%	-4%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	53%	-9%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Sproingp	34%	47%	-13%	51%	-17%

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.

Based on our PM data, our two greatest areas of improvement are Reading and Science. Because students struggle with reading, they also struggle with reading the science assessments.

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

Science declined. More Science needs to be taught across all grade levels.

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.

Dunbar's Science proficiency has the greatest gap from the state average. When meeting as a staff, we discussed the factors leading to this gap were the following:
-students not retaining previous grade level standards being assessed on the 5th grade test
-teachers not making connections between text and hands-on lessons.

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

Our math proficiency increased the most. This is attributed to teachers planning in depth with our math coach and students owning their data with their data folders.

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

We do have multiple students with attendance concerns who are very low academically. Many of these parents are not concerned about improving their child's attendance.

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

Science Proficiency
Bottom Quartile students for Reading
Bottom Quartile students for Math
Proficiency for 3rd grade students in Reading

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

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

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.

Instructional Priority: Create and implement lessons which utilize high leverage instructional practices aligned to our B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

When analyzing our data from last year we determined our deficits were based on the following areas of greatest need:
1. Lack of understanding of the new BEST standards for Reading and Math and new implementation of all the standards at once.
2. All grade levels in Reading and Math, as well as our ESSA subgroups are not at 55% proficient, based on iready and/or district assessments.
3. Planning for individual needs of students

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

By August, 100% of our teachers will be engaged in planning with content coaches, utilizing our BEST standards.

By September 2023, 100% of teachers will implement on grade level, standards-aligned instruction within small groups in ELA and when appropriate in math.
By December 2023, 100% of teachers will utilize Achievement Level Descriptors (grades 3-5) to differentiate within independent work and small group instruction. This will be monitored through the collection of data using site-based walk-through form (school look-fors).
Based on the end of year state and/or district assessment the percent of students scoring a level 3 or higher will improve to 55% in all subjects. The overall learning gains and bottom quartile gains for reading and math will increase to 55%.

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

Administration and instructional coaches will meet weekly and ILT (every 8 weeks) to discuss progress towards our goals. As a leadership team and ILT we will utilize the look-fors developed during preplanning to ensure consistency and fidelity of the implementation of our instructional priority.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

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.)

1) Teachers will use data from assessments and aggressive monitoring to scaffold instruction
2)Teachers will utilize small group instruction to fill instructional gaps through differentiation and acceleration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

John Hatties research shows the effectiveness factor of small group instruction (.47) and differentiation/ RTI (1.29). With the effectiveness hinge point being .40, these two focus points will increase student achievement for ALL students.

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.

The Reading Resource will focus on lesson planning, and pulling small groups. The RR will meet with all ELA teachers weekly to plan for standards-aligned instruction. During planning, the resource teacher and teachers will plan by utilizing a variety of tools, including the ALDs to differentiate instruction for each small group. They will utilize current standards data to plan for enrichment or to fill instructional gaps. This will happen weekly and will be under the supervision of the school principal. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor the implementation of the coaching positions.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

By When: These action steps will take place weekly and be monitored by administration through weekly check-ins.

The Math resource will focus on coaching, modeling, lesson planning, and pulling small groups. The resource teacher will meet with all math teachers weekly to plan for standards-aligned instruction. During planning, the coach and teachers will analyze current and past data to determine an appropriate entry point for each lesson to ensure student success. They will also use current data and/or ALDs to plan for enrichment or to fill instructional gaps. This will happen weekly and will be under the supervision of the school principal. Follow-up data will be collected monthly to progress monitor the implementation of the coaching positions.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

By When: These action steps will take place weekly and be monitored by administration through weekly check-ins.

During Pre-Planning, all instructional staff will work together to develop look-fors derived from our Four Principles of Excellent Instruction. When highlighting our focus look-fors, we will develop a consensus of what they "look like" and "sound like". Teachers will work with our coaches to implement these strategies. These look-fors will be used to monitor progress of our SIP goal.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

By When: This action step will take place during Pre-planning and will be revisited throughout the year. It will be monitored by administration through weekly walk-throughs.

Provide professional development for teachers to observe each other through site-based learning walks. These mini PD sessions will be centered around observing practices related to implementation of BEST Standards, small group instruction, data driven instruction and aggressive monitoring. PD will be ongoing throughout the year, taking place a minimum of once per quarter for both reading and math. Implementation will be monitored by school principal.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

By When: This action step is on-going throughout the year and will be monitored by administration.

Administration and instructional coaches will hold data chats with teachers after each Math and ELA Progress Monitoring Assessment (PMA). During data chats, we will compare overall proficiency and

proficiency by standard. We will utilize this data to inform our planning sessions, each small group's instructional focus, opportunities for acceleration and to monitor growth of all students.

Teachers will then hold data chats with students to share strengths and opportunities of growth following PMAs.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

By When: This action step is on-going throughout the year and will be monitored by administration.

Utilize protocols for planning and PLCs to ensure time is set aside to plan for specific times within a lesson for the teacher to employ checks for understanding in all subjects.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

By When: This action step is on-going throughout the year and will be monitored by administration.

Purchase supplies for highly engaging and standards based lessons. Supplies needed include copy paper, student consumable supplies, toner, folders, headphones for laptops, pencil sharpeners, metal file folder holders used for holding laptops, colored paper, markers, labels, ziplock bags, etc…

Person Responsible: Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

By When: This action step is on-going throughout the year and will be monitored by administration.

Create a master schedule to include opportunities for teachers to meet with coaches, utilize planning resources and create engaging lessons for students. Planning sessions will take place weekly and monitored by school principal

Person Responsible: Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

By When: This action step is on-going throughout the year and will be monitored by administration.

Purchase updated technology and technology supplies to make standards-based lessons engaging for all students. Technology will include, but not be limited to interactive displays, document cameras, printers and projectors and include toner, headphones, etc…

Person Responsible: Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

By When: This action step is on-going throughout the year and will be monitored by administration.

Meet with ESE Teachers after each district assessment to review student data and determine if students are making growth.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Crim (cynthia.crim@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#2. 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.

Our Area of Focus is Culture and Environment specifically related to Community Involvement.

After analyzing our data we determined our school culture would be enhanced with more support from our local community.

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

By September, each grade level will have a classroom connector volunteer assigned to their grade level.
By October, 100% of our classes will have participated in standards-aligned lessons from a community member on a Medical Monday or Wellness Wednesday.
By October, we will have a committee to plan parent events that have a minimum of 3 community members.

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

Administrative secretaries will pull monthly volunteer data reports to determine if we are meeting our goal.

Our Magnet Lead Teacher will work with local medical partners to teach wellness lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Kunis (sarah.kunis@hcps.net)

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.)

Tutoring and Mentoring groups for SWD and other at-risk students through partnerships with local community groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

John Hatties research shows the effectiveness factor for Parental and Community Involvement has an effect size of .50. This focus point will increase student achievement for ALL students.

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.

During pre-planning, we will hold a meeting with school volunteers and community members explaining our school goals, and ways for volunteers to get involved.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Quintyne (alexandra.quintyne@hcps.net)

By When: By the end of preplanning.

The magnet lead teacher will schedule monthly speakers with community members to teach grade level & standards based science lessons tied to our magnet theme of health and wellness.

Person Responsible: Sarah Kunis (sarah.kunis@hcps.net)

By When: This action step is ongoing.

We will meet with our community partner, HPUMC to host Student of the Month celebrations.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Quintyne (alexandra.quintyne@hcps.net)

By When: This action step is ongoing.

Work with Mitchell PTA to sponsor quarterly pancake breakfasts for perfect attendance. This will have a direct impact on our students with attendance challenges.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Quintyne (alexandra.quintyne@hcps.net)

By When: At the end of each quarter.

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).

Based on our SWD, we will utilize title 1 funds to provide extra support in small groups. We will meet with teachers throughout the year to discuss support needed for students to be successful.

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

Based on iready data students in K- 2 need more explicit instruction in foundational skills to ensure students are reading on level by the time they leave their assigned grade. Instruction in phonics will be improved through small group and explicit instruction utilizing UFLI Foundations.

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

Based on the 2021 ELA FSA Scores, 39% in grade 3rd grade and 43% in 4th grade scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was due to students not leaving the primary grades reading on level and having large gaps to fill in intermediate grades. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include aggressive monitoring with feedback and acceleration, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on FAST.

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

The percent of students scoring in the proficient range will increase to a minimum of 50% as measured by the end of year STAR assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of 3rd and 4th grade students scoring at (a) 3 or higher on FSAT will increase to 50% as measured by May 2023.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored through planning sessions, and implementation of the plans. Both the principal and assistant principal will monitor implementation in classrooms and provide feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Crim, Cynthia, cynthia.crim@hcps.net

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?

Develop & implement student success criteria, accountability, and feedback practices in order to increase student ownership of work and active engagement.

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?

In 2023, the data showed that students were successful during the "I do, and we do" portions of gradual release but really struggled with independent practice. The improvement strategy of providing success criteria and feedback will allow teachers to aggressively monitor student understanding, resulting in knowing how to accelerate learning in small groups which will lead to improved student academic performance in ELA.

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
The reading coach will develop and implement professional development for primary teachers around a strong ELA instructional block, and how phonics is embedded within the block. This action step will be monitored by our principal.	Crim, Cynthia, cynthia.crim@hcps.net

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.

Our school website houses our SIP. We also discuss (and vote on our SIP) our SIP with our SAC team and PTA.
https://dunbar.mysdhc.org

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))

Dunbar has multiple events throughout the school year to engage parents in their child's learning. We send out translatable monthly newsletters with upcoming events and progress towards our school's goals.
https://dunbar.mysdhc.org

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))

Dunbar is implementing UFLI Foundations to increase phonics skills in primary classrooms. Students in intermediate will be pulled in small groups to enrich and accelerate their learning in both reading and math.

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