Dunnellon Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Dunnellon Elementary School

10235 SW 180TH AVENUE RD, Dunnellon, FL 34432

[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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
English, Karen	Principal	Principal will develop a continuum of intervention supports for both behavior and academic, which are readily accessible as soon as a student is indicated at risk or off track. Develop effective intervention plans and provide prevention supports, which act to prevent students from becoming disengaged or developing skills deficits. Data will be analyzed to make changes that will help increase student achievement.
Tarantino, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Work with principal and content area specialists to develop continuum of intervention supports for both behavior and academics, which are readily accessible as soon as a student is indicated as at risk or off track. Develop effective intervention plans and provide prevention supports which act to prevent students from becoming disengaged or developing skills deficits. Data will be analyzed to make changes that will help increase student achievement.
Savage, Alyson	School Counselor	School counselor is in charge of implementing the Social Emotional Learning program at the school and supporting the MTSS process for behavior and academics schoolwide. The counselor communicates with parents about attendance and runs meetings to discuss absences and tardies with the support of the school social worker and Assistant Principal.
Boshela, Brenda	Instructional Coach	Literacy CAS is the lead for professional development in the area of reading as well as assisting with other curriculum based professional development throughout the school year. She is also involved in the SAC committee and assisting with planning Parent and Family Engagement.
Martinez, Gloria	Dean	The dean is in charge of discipline and assisting with the implementation of the Social Emotional Learning Program at the school. She also assists with Parent and Family Engagement Plan and its implementation. Part of the discipline role is working with teachers and students to assist them in decreasing behavioral problems in the classroom to decrease the loss of instructional time lost due to misbehaviors.
Scott, Joy	Math Coach	The Math Coach is the lead for professional development in the area of math as well as assisting with other curriculum based professional development throughout the school year. She is also involved in the SAC committee and assisting with planning Parent and Family Engagement Activities.

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.

Development of the SIP is made through the collection of information and valuable input from the Principal, Assistant Principal, Content Area Specialists, instructional and non-instructional staff members as well as parents and the local community. Careful consideration of information collected was used as a driving force towards the SIP development 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 of the SIP will be conducted during leadership and staff meetings. Monitoring of the SIP will include an intentional focus on those students and subject areas with the greatest achievement gap. Additionally, review of data for students in the focused area will be regularly conducted, resulting in additional instructional support where needed.

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
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: B 2018-19: B 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	32	30	30	31	20	26	0	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	2	8	3	10	10	11	0	0	0	44
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	8	23	19	6	2	0	0	0	61
Course failure in Math	3	6	15	6	2	4	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	18	30	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	31	23	0	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	24	30	39	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	13	25	36	54	33	44	0	0	0	205

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	26	31	17	25	17	19	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	6	3	3	2	4	10	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	10	21	32	30	16	18	0	0	0	127
Course failure in Math	7	15	32	24	14	33	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	17	28	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	18	41	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	9	19	26	20	13	18	0	0	0	105

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	2	18	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) 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	26	31	17	25	17	19	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	6	3	3	2	4	10	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	10	21	32	30	16	18	0	0	0	127
Course failure in Math	7	15	32	24	14	33	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	17	28	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	18	41	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	9	19	26	20	13	18	0	0	0	105

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	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	20
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*	44	44	53	50	46	56	49		
ELA Learning Gains				60			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			48		
Math Achievement*	45	50	59	51	50	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				58			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			46		
Science Achievement*	54	46	54	45	53	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					49	52			
Graduation Rate					41	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	54	57	59	60			25		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	239
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	10	Yes	4	2
ELL	27	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	4	1
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	40	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	41			

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	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	38	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	3	
HSP	50			
MUL	39	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	47			

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	44			45			54					54
SWD	13			11			0				4	
ELL	26			29			10				5	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			26							2	
HSP	37			40			33				5	50
MUL	36			43							2	
PAC												
WHT	50			48			65				4	
FRL	40			36			47				5	45

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	50	60	52	51	58	45	45					60
SWD	13	38	38	13	41	35	13					
ELL	37	57	50	38	35	27	0					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	43		19	54							
HSP	47	68	62	52	56	31	27					60
MUL	27			50								
PAC												
WHT	56	59	50	55	61	43	54					
FRL	38	53	48	42	52	41	32					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	52	48	47	52	46	48					25
SWD	10	17	25	18	44		0					
ELL	9	21		19	46							25
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			11								
HSP	32	33	45	41	60	55	32					27
MUL	30											
PAC												
WHT	59	61	40	54	52		58					
FRL	42	48	56	39	53	47	48					27

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	56%	49%	7%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	48%	-10%	58%	-20%
03	2023 - Spring	37%	39%	-2%	50%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	39%	48%	-9%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	53%	-8%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	43%	10%	51%	2%

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.

ELA Achievement levels over the last three (3) years using the FSA, indicate:

Our overall ELA Achievement using the FSA decreased 1% in 2019-2021, from 50% to 49%, and a 1% increase in 2021-2022 from 49% to 50%.

Although students were tested during the 2022-2023 school year with the new FAST, the trends show a little to no increase in ELA achievement from the previous years.

ELA Achievement levels according to the FAST for the 2022-2023 school year, indicate:
The grades 3-5 Reading Proficiency is 46% and is the lowest when compared to Math Proficiency of 47% and State Assessment Science Proficiency of 53%.

FAST Reading 3rd grade had an increase of 23% from PM1 and PM3, while 4th grade Reading increased 20% between PM1 and PM3, and 5th grade Reading showed an increase of 24% from PM1 and PM3.

In addition, four (4) of our Federal Index Sub-Groups show proficiency levels well below our school

average when comparing the 2021-2022 school year: Black students (36%), ELL students (38%), SWD (27%) and Multi-Racial students (39%).

Math Achievement levels of the last three (3) years using the FSA, indicate:

Overall Math Achievement using the FSA decreased 12% in 2019-2021, from 59% to 47%, and a 4% increase in 2021-2022 from 47% to 51%.

Students were tested during the 2022-2023 school year with the new FAST Assessment, the trends show a decrease in Math achievement from the previous years.

Math Proficiency levels with FAST for the 2022-2023 school year, indicate:
The grades 3-5 Math Proficiency is 47% and is slightly higher than the ELA Proficiency of 46%, with a higher State Assessment Science Proficiency of 53%.

FAST Math 3rd grade had an increase of 23% from PM1 to PM3, while 4th grade Math increased 20% between PM1 and PM3, and 5th grade Math had the highest increase of 42% from PM1 and PM3.

Contributing factors that may have had an impact on the low performance for ELA and Math:
The 2022-2023 school year was the first time students used the FAST for their state assessment.
The 2022-2023 school year was the first time students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades completed the state assessment in an online platform.
Due to the implementation of the Florida B.E.S.T. standards during the 2022-2023 school year, teachers were providing instruction on standards of which they did not have full understanding.
Implementation and utilization of new Envision textbooks for Math.

Science Achievement levels over the last three years using the State Assessment, indicate:

Overall Science Achievement using the State Assessment increased 5% in 2019-2021, from 43% to 48%, but showed a 3% decrease in 2021-2022 from 48% to 45%. From 2022 to 2023 science increased from 45% to 53%.

Science Proficiency levels according to the State Assessment for the 2022-2023 school year, indicate the following:
The 5th grade science proficiency is 53%, which is higher than the grades 3-5 Reading Proficiency of 46% and grades 3-5 Math Proficiency of 47%.

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

ELA has the greatest decline in the prior three (3) years indicating a 0% increase in achievement and the 46% grades 3-5 Reading Proficiency of the FAST. Math has also decreased by 8% in the prior three (3) years, even though it scored slightly higher than Reading Proficiency on the FAST.

Contributing factors that may have had an impact on the low performance for ELA and Math are the following:
The 2022-2023 school year was the first time students used the FAST for their state assessment.
The 2022-2023 school year was the first time students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades completed the state assessment in an online platform.
Due to the implementation of the Florida B.E.S.T. standards during the 2022-2023 school year, teachers were providing instruction on standards of which they did not have full understanding.
Implementation and utilization of new Envision textbooks for Math.

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.

Grades 3-5 Math Proficiency of 47% has the greatest gap when compared to the state average of 58%. Specifically, 3rd grade Math had the greatest gap of proficiency 39% compared to the state proficiency of 59%.
Factors that may have contributed to this gap are as follows:
Increased number of teacher absences due to health reasons.
New teacher to the grade level and change of teachers halfway through the year.
As a result of the new teacher addition, students were placed in new classrooms.
New Envision curriculum for the grade level.

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

5th grade Science showed the most improvement in proficiency with 53% compared to the state of 51%.
New actions taken were the following:
One teacher taught Fifth Grade science for the entire grade level, allowing for consistency within the teaching of the standards.

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

SWD, ELL, Black and Multi-racial students are our major area of concern. SWD have a Federal Percent of Points Index of 27%, which falls below the 41% marker. Another concern is ELL students with a Federal Percent of Points Index at 38%, which falls below the 41% marker. Additionally, Black students have a Federal Percent of Points Index of 36% and Multi-racial students at 39%, which both fall below the 41% Federal Percent of Points Index.

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

We want our SWD, ELL, Black and Multi-racial students to show growth and meet grade level proficiency in ELA, Math and Science. Improving student attendance remains a top priority. Collaborative planning and instructional practices with the use of math and reading coaches for the improvement of understanding and teaching to the intended depth of the standards, creating small group, differentiated instruction and developing teacher-made assessments.

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

#1. 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.

The Area of Focus is a Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to a Safe and Positive Learning and Working Environment.

Today's teachers are presented with challenges due in part to new social norms, making it difficult to an already challenging, yet important career that impacts our students.

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

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

In comparing the results from the Climate and Culture Student Surveys, from the beginning of the year and end of year we will see a 5% increase in the number of students who select Always and Often.

In comparing the results from the Climate and Culture Staff Surveys, from the beginning of the year and end of year we will see a 5% increase in the number of staff members who select Always and Often.

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

We will share the data with our teachers to problem solve on areas of weakness and address those areas with strategies to implement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Tarantino (matthew.tarantino@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.)

The Caring School Community curriculum will be utilized to support a positive learning environment and culture.

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

Caring School Community is the State adopted curriculum.

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.

Classroom walkthroughs to observe SEL lessons and morning meetings being delivered with fidelity.

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

By When: Monthly

Team building will take place with our staff to build our culture and community.

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

By When: Monthly

New teachers to Marion County will be provided with a mentor teacher for ongoing support. They will attend monthly meetings with their mentor teacher. Teachers new to Dunnellon Elementary will be provided support by members of the grade level team.

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

By When: Monthly

#2. 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.

SWD have had three (3) years of consecutive proficiency below the Federal % Points Index. 2021-2022 data indicates the SWD are only 27% proficient compared to the 41% marker.

ELL have had three (3) years of consecutive proficiency below the Federal % Points Index. 2021-2022 data indicates the ELL students are only 38% proficient compared to the 41% marker.

BLK students have had three (3) years of consecutive proficiency below the Federal % Points Index. 2021-2022 data indicates the ELL students are only 36% proficient compared to the 41% marker.

Multi-Racial students have had three (3) years of consecutive proficiency below the Federal % Points Index. 2021-2022 data indicates the ELL students are only 39R% proficient compared to the 41% marker.

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

Results from the 2023-2024 State Assessment (F.A.S.T.) will show a 5% increase over the 2022-2023 test results. Results from the 2023-2024 State Science Assessment will show a 55% proficiency scoring.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Karen English (karen.english@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.)

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

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

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

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.

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

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

By When: Teachers will collaborate to plan benchmark aligned math instruction following CPA models. Assessment data will provide information for next steps in planning instruction for student mastery.

Substitutes will be provided to our teachers to plan benchmark aligned instruction. Teachers will then be able to observe other teachers teaching benchmark aligned lessons.

Person Responsible: Brenda Boshela (brenda.boshela@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: We will begin these steps in October 2023.

Provide professional development in focused instruction strategies that will increase student proficiency and encourage the use of gradual release in lesson planning and to provide students opportunities for productive struggle.

Person Responsible: Joy Scott (joy.scott@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: We will begin this in October 2023.

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).

Staff members and our SAC reviewed resources that were used to address low-performance of students in our ESSA subgroups. The Literacy and Math Coach positions are fully funded through the Title One program which allows them to work with teachers in reviewing students data and selecting and providing effective instruction. We also utilize funding for other staff members including Title One ESE paraprofessionals who provide support to our low-performing 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

The Instructional Focus for kindergarten will be to provide intensive instruction for mastery in phonics, using Savvas, UFLI for Tier 1 and UFLI and SIPPS or Haggerty for Tiers 2-3. Instructional focus for grades 1 and 2 will be to provide intensive instruction in phonics using Savvas, UFLI for Tier 1 and UFLI, SIPPS and Haggerty for Tiers 2 and 3. Instructional focus for grade 3 will be to provide intensive instruction with Savvas for Tier 1, Lexia Core 5 or UFLI or SIPPS for Tiers 2 or 3. Grade 3 will receive additional intensive vocabulary and comprehension instruction using Lexia Core 5. Language Power will be used for all ESOL students, as needed.

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

The Instructional Focus for grades 4 and 5 will be to provide intensive instruction for mastery in fluency, vocabulary and comprehension and phonics, as needed. Savvas will be used for Tier 1, Read 180 for vocabulary and comprehension and SIPPS for intensive phonics instruction. Read Live will also be used for fluency. Language Power will be used for all ESOL students, as needed.

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

Kindergarten: The percentage of students in last year's kindergarten/this year grade 1, indicates 40% of students not on track to score Level 3 on grade 3 FAST ELA.

The targeted goal is to decrease the percentage of students not on track from 40% to 25%, resulting in overall student mastery of 75%, an increase of 15%.

Grade 1: The percentage of students in last year's grades 1/this year's grade 2, indicates 53% of students not on track to score Level 3 on grade 3 FAST ELA.

The targeted goal is to decrease the percentage of students not on track from 53% to 38%, resulting in overall student mastery of 62%, an increase of 15%.

Grade 2: The percentage of students in last year's grade 2/this year's grade 3, indicates 56% of students not on track to score Level 3 on grade 3 FAST ELA.

The targeted goal is to decrease the percentage of students not on track from 56% to 36%, resulting in overall student mastery of 64%, an increase of 20%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grade 3:The percentage of students below Level 3 in last year's grade 3/this year's grade 4, indicates 63% of students not on track to score Level 3 or above on FAST ELA.

The targeted goal is to decrease the percentage of students not on track from 63% to 48%, resulting in overall student mastery of 52%, an increase of 15%.

Grade 4: The percentage of students below Level 3 in last year's grade 4/this year's grade 5, indicates 62% of students not on track to score Level 3 or above on FAST ELA.

The targeted goal is to decrease the percentage of student not on track from 62% to 47%, resulting in overall student mastery of 52%, an increase of 15%.

Grade 5: The percentage of students below Level 3 in last year's grade 5 was 57%.

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.

Area of Focus will be monitored through the collection of formative assessment data and the data review from State testing results (F.A.S.T.) and District Progress Monitoring Assessments (DPMA).

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

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

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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?

Students who are in need of intervention in reading will be placed into an intensive instructional program that will address their specific area of need. Programs used during the MTSS block are: S.I.P.P. (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words; Heggerty for Phonological Awareness; Language Power (Oral Language); Read Naturally; Lexia Core 5; or Read 180.
In addition, we will utilize one of Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies (scaffolding which has a 0.82 effect size). Typically, the four steps include: I do, We do, You do together, and then You do alone. this scaffolds the learning process and supports students through guided practice.

Rationale:
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?

Each of the above intervention programs addresses areas of specific needs and students are placed in those programs based on their need.
The programs were selected by MCPS because they have shown to be effective for the targeted population.

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

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
K-5 teachers will collaborate each week to plan phonics and vocabulary instruction and use of scaffolding reading strategies within the ELA block. Teachers should show evidence of scaffolding at the beginning of a learning task and as needed when students need support. Literacy Coaching and Professional Learning will be part of this action step. During our Literacy Leadership meetings data will be reviewed to determine professional development needs.	Tarantino, Matthew, matthew.tarantino@marion.k12.fl.us
On-going student data from formative assessments and in program assessments for our intervention groups will be monitored for student progress. The data will be used to determine next steps for students within the intervention programs and to identify students who may need a change in placement within our MTSS intervention materials. On-going review of assessments will be part of this action step.	Boshela, Brenda, brenda.boshela@marion.k12.fl.us
The CAS for both Literacy and Math will provide coaching and modeling for classrooms not making adequate progress. On-going student data from formative assessments and in program assessments for our intervention groups will be monitored to determine those classrooms in need of support.	English, Karen, karen.english@marion.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.

Hardcopies of the 23-24 SIP will be provided to all stakeholders upon request. Copies will also be made available at the scheduled SAC meetings and will be published on the school website:https://www.marionschools.net/dne.
Parents and stakeholders will be provided with Spanish translation through our ELL staff members.

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))

The Family Engagement Plan will be made available on the school's website:https://www.marionschools.net/dne. Scheduled events throughout the year including math night, literacy night, etc., will provide stakeholders with opportunities to be informed of their child's progress.

Required parent conferences are scheduled two times per year, where parents can meet with their child's teacher and additionally, student-led conferences are held so that students can share their progress with their parents, taking ownership in their learning.

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))

Through quality collaborative planning, the math and reading coaches will work with the teachers in learning how to unravel the benchmarks, to understand the true intent and depth of the benchmark , while creating effective instructional practices. Teachers will learn how to scaffold instruction using gradual release, and allowing students to experience productive struggle while learning the focused content. Additionally, teachers will become proficient in identifying effective instruction for students in small groups, differentiating lessons and maximizing their time for instruction.

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