



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>21</b>

## Dr N H Jones Elementary School

1900 SW 5TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[ 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.**

In an innovative environment, students will excel in basic academics with enhanced learning in STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Mathematics).

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Dr. N. H. Jones Elementary, where every child will achieve academic excellence.

### 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
Hensel, Rob	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school. He/She works with stakeholders to develop a common vision and mission for the school. He/She guides and works with the leadership team to analyze student data in order to monitor student progress to drive instruction and provide curriculum resources aligned to the Florida standards; develop a program that promotes professional development based on evaluations and feedback in order to retain an effective/highly effective staff; and build relationships with parents and the community.
Coleman, Lisa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through his/her expertise in curriculum and analyzing student data to drive decision making for instruction. The assistant principal also supports the teachers by using evaluations and observations to determine staff needs in professional development and instructional support through mentoring, modeling, and coaching.
Woelfel, Kelly	School Counselor	The school counselor provides support for social emotional learning; provides experiences for students to explore career development; helps students to problem solve and cope effectively to be become productive citizens within our community. The school counselor also supports students by monitoring attendance concerns.
Basel, Lori-anne	Instructional Coach	The reading coach provides expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff; uses leading/lagging student data and/or staff surveys to provide professional development opportunities; and/or supports students by modeling instructional strategies.
Bryant, Alexis	Dean	The student service manager works with the principal primarily to develop guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies as well as procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning. She maintains visibility and accessibility on the school campus and at school-related activities and events during work day. She also works together with the school counselor to support students with problem solving and coping effectively to be become productive citizens within our community.
Altobello, Kristin	School Counselor	The school counselor provides support for social emotional learning; provides experiences for students to explore career development; helps students to problem solve and cope effectively to be become productive citizens within our community. The school counselor also supports students by monitoring attendance concerns.

**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.

Administration and teachers reviewed school data in June. The team noticed a need to strengthen our ESE students' reading abilities. The team helped write the school improvement plan to include cooperative learning as a strategy to help all students' reading abilities. The plan will be presented to the School Advisory Council in order for it to ask questions, add input, and approve of it.

**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 SIP will be monitored regularly by administration and SAC. Student data will be reviewed after each state progress monitoring assessment. Administration will review teachers' implementation of cooperative learning strategies and share this data with teachers monthly. Both data sets will be shared with SAC as well. If student and/or teacher data are not trending upward, administration will revise the SIP in order to better meet our students' needs and increase their reading abilities. If it is revised, SAC will be kept abreast of any changes.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	65%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	68%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)



<p align="center"><b>School Grades History</b></p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: A
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	3	17	10	10	7	11	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	2	6	9	11	7	9	0	0	0	44
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	7	5	18	13	2	5	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	9	4	11	5	4	3	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	5	6	12	15	14	6	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	2	2	10	20	8	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	8	3	4	5	3	0	0	0	27

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	2	3	15	38	22	30	0	0	0	110

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	6	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	15	3	4	10	9	2	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	4	6	15	8	11	6	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA	13	25	26	11	7	5	0	0	0	87
Course failure in Math	11	11	17	13	11	6	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	16	5	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	12	2	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	11	13	20	12	7	6	0	0	0	69

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	15	3	4	10	9	2	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	4	6	15	8	11	6	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA	13	25	26	11	7	5	0	0	0	87
Course failure in Math	11	11	17	13	11	6	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	16	5	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	12	2	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	11	13	20	12	7	6	0	0	0	69

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	73	44	53	77	46	56	81		
ELA Learning Gains				66			74		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			64		
Math Achievement*	75	50	59	81	50	50	81		
Math Learning Gains				83			76		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			67		
Science Achievement*	69	46	54	81	53	59	78		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					49	52			
Graduation Rate					41	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		57	59						

\* 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	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	290
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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	24	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	98			
BLK	46			
HSP	66			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	85			

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	53			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	55			
HSP	67			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	57			

**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	73			75			69					
SWD	23			30							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	96			94			100				4	
BLK	50			46			43				4	
HSP	68			70			50				4	
MUL	68			86							3	

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	85			90			79				4	
FRL	57			51			57				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	77	66	49	81	83	66	81					
SWD	41	40		40								
ELL	60			70								
AMI												
ASN	87	75		93	97		81					
BLK	54	52	32	61	75	61	50					
HSP	63	57		68	80							
MUL	84	79		94	85							
PAC												
WHT	89	69	67	90	83	71	94					
FRL	59	59	32	62	73	50	67					

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	81	74	64	81	76	67	78					
SWD				40								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	84	80		95	90		100					
BLK	64	61	50	60	61	69	29					
HSP	74			78								
MUL	83			83								
PAC												
WHT	89	78	82	87	77		88					
FRL	61	50	45	59	61	64	38					

**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	77%	49%	28%	54%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	48%	34%	58%	24%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	39%	29%	50%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	48%	22%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	53%	31%	61%	23%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	50%	30%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	69%	43%	26%	51%	18%

**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.**

Only 69% of our 5th grade students demonstrated proficiency. This was a decline of 12% from the previous year. Our admission requirements changed from students having to test to get into our school to a lottery based admission system. Last year's 5th grade cohort was the first group of students who did not have to test to be admitted into our school. We also had one section of support facilitation for 5th grade which was also new for our school.

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

Only 69% of our 5th grade students demonstrated proficiency. This was a decline of 12% from the previous year. Our admission requirements changed from students having to test to get into our school to a lottery based admission system. Last year's 5th grade cohort was the first group of students who did not have to test to be admitted into our school. We also had one section of support facilitation for 5th grade which was also new for our school.

**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.**

All of our grade levels outperformed the state average in all subject areas. The smallest gap was in third grade math. Our students only outperformed the state average by 11 percentage points. The state average was 59% proficiency and our school's average was 70% proficiency. We attribute this smaller achievement gap to our students' transition from second to third grade along with new state assessments.

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

Unfortunately, our school declined in each assessment area.

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

One area of concern for our school is attendance. Since our students either walk to school or are dropped off by a parent, we have many tardies. Our attendance team is meeting to incentivize students as well as parents in an effort to get our students here on time and in attendance.

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

- 1) Providing collaborative learning structures for our students in order to increase their reading abilities
- 2) improving our tardy rate
- 3) improving our attendance rate
- 4) improving our 5th grade students' science assessment proficiency

### **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.

Our subgroup of ESE students were only 40% proficient as measured by the state FAST reading assessment.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Teachers will provide opportunities for students to collaboratively learn weekly; therefore, our ESE students will increase their scale score on the 2024 FAST state assessment in reading by an average of 10 points. A ten point reading gain will move our ESE students to the next tier and improve their reading abilities.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration and teachers will monitor our ESE students' success using DPMA & FAST data throughout the school year. We will reteach nonproficient skills, tutor, and/or provide extra time during the school day for these students in order for them to show proficiency on their standards.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.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.)

Teachers will plan and use collaborative learning weekly.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative learning promotes the development of higher-level thinking, oral communication, self-management, and leadership skills; increases student retention, self-esteem, and responsibility; helps expose students to and an increase in understanding of diverse perspectives; and prepares students for real life social and employment situations.

**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.

Teachers need training and professional development on how and why to use collaborative learning in their classrooms.

**Person Responsible:** Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** A Kagan consultant will train staff on Friday, August 4th, 2023.

Teachers will need to design lessons that utilize collaborative learning.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Coleman (lisa.coleman@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Teachers will plan twice a week in PLCs, and this will be an ongoing process all year.

Administration will need to ensure collaborative learning is occurring in classrooms and if our students are improving their reading abilities.

**Person Responsible:** Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Administration will conduct monthly walkthroughs to collect data on collaborative learning taken place in our classrooms. They will also analyze student reading data after each progress monitoring.

## #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

### 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.

Students were assigned an unexcused tardy 4,131 times last school year.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

By explaining and educating the importance of arriving to school on time and by providing incentives to students and parents, our school will see a decrease of 5% in our unexcused tardies this school year as compared to last school year's data.

### Monitoring:

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

Our attendance team will monitor our tardy data monthly.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Woelfel (kelly.woelfel@marion.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.)

We will utilize our Caring School Community program school wide.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students and teachers will build relationships with one another. This program allows for class discussions and problem-solving. Their classroom will foster a community and sense of belonging due to the utilization of Caring School Community. Students will want to be on time and come to school as well due to the community our classrooms have fostered.

### 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.

Teachers need to be trained on how to implement Caring School Community in their rooms.

**Person Responsible:** Kelly Woelfel (kelly.woelfel@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** August 8, 2023

Tardiness of students needs to be monitored.

**Person Responsible:** Kelly Woelfel (kelly.woelfel@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** This will be ongoing and monthly.

## 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).

Administration will review the funding allocations over the summer and allocate monies to resources in order to support the SIP. The rationale and budgets will be shared with the School Advisory Council. Where the funding was generated to support each area of focus will also be shared with SAC.

## 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.

SIP is found at <https://www.marionschools.net/nhj> under News and information on the main page. We also notify parents through newsletters and weekly call outs that a copy of the SIP is available in the front office.

**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))

PFEP is found at <https://www.marionschools.net/nhj> under News and information on the main page. We also notify parents through newsletters and weekly call outs that a copy of the PFEP is available in the front office.

**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)**

Teachers will provide opportunities for students to collaboratively learn weekly. This is an area of focus for our school. Collaborative learning helps improve the abilities of all students. Teachers can use this to strategically pair and group students for tier one, remedial, or acceleration purposes.

**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

**Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

**Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

**Budget Approval**

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No