Dommerich Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Dommerich Elementary

601 N THISTLE LN, Maitland, FL 32751

https://dommeriches.ocps.net/

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

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
Permenter, Laura	Principal	-Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, collaborative lesson planning, and effective instructional practices and intervention. -Manages resources, including facilities, budgets, staff, materials, and supplies, that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement. -Facilitates high-quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement_Maintains communication with all stakeholders. -Conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations providing actionable feedback. -Monitors schoolwide data and School Improvement Plan areas of focus. -Monitors and guides the school leadership team.
Martin, Janet	Assistant Principal	-Monitors schoolwide data and School Improvement Plan areas of focus. -Conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations providing actionable feedback. -Monitors schoolwide data and School Improvement Plan areas of focus. -Monitors design and implementation of tutoring and school enrichment programs. -Serves as partner and liaison with stakeholders.
Swank, Carolina	Curriculum Resource Teacher	-Facilitates district and state assessment. -Provides instructional resources and support to teachers. -Participates and guides common planning sessions at PLCs. -Develops professional development for staff. -Serves as an expert on district resources and standards. -Monitors Lowest 25%. -Supports MTSS small groups.
Silvester, Jody	Instructional Coach	-Develops professional development for staff. -Provides instructional resources and support to teachers. -Participates and guides common planning sessions at PLCs. -Facilitates Deliberate Practice developments with teachers. -Serves as an expert on district resources and standards. -Supports and reviews common assessments. -Monitors Lowest 25%. -Supports MTSS small groups.
Seyler, Lisa	Staffing Specialist	-Provides information to the staff on ESE strategies and accommodations. -Collaborates with teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders to write IEPs that provide appropriate services to meet the individual needs of the students. -Involved in the various decisions regarding the ESE population such as curriculum and safety. -Communicate with team members and help resolve and clarify concerns on an as-needed basis.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-Facilitates the analysis and use of interim and state assessment data to inform instructional and placement of students.
Fratrik, Jessica	Other	-Ensures the social emotional support of students through curriculum and programs. -Educates families on resources for academic and social development. -Creates a a positive environment where students feel safe. -Serves in a guidance role.
Clem, Sarah	Teacher, ESE	-Provides specialized instruction to help exceptional students meet their IEP goals. -Monitors progress for ESE students. -Collaborates with classroom teachers and teams to ensure students unique needs are met.
Aydt, Marcy	Instructional Media	-Designs and implements monitoring systems for digital devices. -Provides training and support for digital materials. Supports the wellbeing of students and a positive school culture through news shows and other media programs. -Collaborates with teachers to supplement and extend the curriculum with resources and support. -Teaches students how to conduct research and how to determine the validity and reliability of information.
Opalka, Jessica	Behavior Specialist	-Provides information to the staff on behavior strategies for improved student behavior. -Collaborates with teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders to develop behavior plans that provide appropriate services to meet the individual needs of the students. -Involved in the various decisions regarding the ESE population as it pertains to behavior and safety. -Communicate with team members and help resolve and clarify concerns on an as-needed basis.

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 process for involving stakeholders, including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, and parents, begins as soon as the school performance data is received by the principal. Together with the AP, the data is reviewed and broken down first by grade levels, then by individual teachers. This review of data informs us of the level of support that is needed by individual teachers or grade levels. The data is then included in a plan for the leadership team to review.

The data is reviewed and analyzed by the leadership team when we meet as a team to plan for the new school year. During this review, each member of the leadership team is able to ask questions and give input on the data. At the end of this review, the team is able to identify new SIP goals based on whether the data improved or not or remained static for the new school year.

The data is presented to teachers and classified staff when both groups return to school. Teachers will see the data in our welcome-back PowerPoint. Teachers are asked to review the data by grade level teams and share their findings. Staff are very complimentary of other grade levels who perform well and are critical of their own performance if it is not at their expectation. Teachers are then asked what they think the goals for the new SIP should be.

Once classified staff returns, the data is shared so they can see how we performed as a school. We also take the time to share the part each member of the classified team, from the front desk clerk to the custodian, plays in the success of our school data.

The school data is finally shared with parents at the first School Advisory Council meeting. Parents are able to ask questions and share concerns and offer input on action steps that we can take as a school to support our areas of focus.

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 regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards on a quarterly basis. This will be done through classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, data chats with teachers, student progress monitoring: after common assessments, and diagnostic tests.

The leadership team will review the data on a quarterly basis. The criteria that will be used by the leadership
team to make adjustments will include a review of the performance bands for each assessment. The number of students who are performing at proficient levels for their grades will be compared to the SIP goals. If students are consistently meeting the goals, or falling below the goals, the SIP goals will be revised, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. Changes will be reported to the SAC.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	21%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No

ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (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	0	2	4	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	4	5	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	4	5	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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*	87	57	53	89	56	56	88		
ELA Learning Gains				70			70		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				73			59		
Math Achievement*	88	60	59	93	46	50	89		
Math Learning Gains				85			84		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				81			73		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	95	63	54	92	61	59	86		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		59	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	90
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	83
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	583
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	57			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	76			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	95			
FRL	69			

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	55			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	84			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	75			

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	87			88			95					
SWD	48			52			73				4	
ELL	60			60							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			57							2	
HSP	69			71			86				4	
MUL	86			86							2	
PAC												
WHT	92			94			100				4	
FRL	61			69			85				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	89	70	73	93	85	81	92					
SWD	56	61	62	64	44		40					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			64	50							
HSP	80	75	87	88	89	86	86					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	92	71	73	95	86	83	98					
FRL	69	67	69	78	84	88	70					

| 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	88	70	59	89	84	73	86					
SWD	41			71								
ELL	67			73								

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			35								
HSP	80	57		78	71		64					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	94	74		96	94	92	97					
FRL	67	58	57	67	65	55	61					

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	85%	54%	31%	54%	31%
04	2023 - Spring	89%	60%	29%	58%	31%
03	2023 - Spring	88%	52%	36%	50%	38%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	89%	59%	30%	59%	30%
04	2023 - Spring	90%	62%	28%	61%	29%
05	2023 - Spring	87%	55%	32%	55%	32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	94%	59%	35%	51%	43%

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.

Dommerich Elementary will focus on increasing proficiency in reading and math as a result of the FSA data for 2022-23.

Overall historical school grade comparison:
Year ELA Proficiency Math Proficiency Science
2020-21 88% 89% 86%
2021-22 89% 93% 92%
2022-23 87% 88% 94%

In analyzing the three components, we decreased in two, ELA and math. From 2022 to 2023, ELA decreased by 2 points and math decreased by 5 points.

Science increased by 4 points.

Proficiency by grades for ELA and math are shown below.
Grade Subject Score Subject Score
3 ELA 88% Math 88%
4 ELA 89% Math 90%
5 ELA 85% Math 87%

No ESSA groups are below the Federal index of 41%.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 5th-grade ELA. The contributing factors to last year's performance were five Level 1 Tier 3 students, one with a substantial reading deficiency and three with two or more early warning indicators.

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

Another data component that showed low performance was 5th-grade math. The contributing factors to last year's performance were five Level 1 Tier 3 students, one with a substantial reading deficiency and three with two or more early warning indicators.

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.

None of our data components were below the state average. Dommerich has consistently performed above the state's average.

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

Based on the FSA data from 2022-23, the data component that showed the most improvement was science. Trended data shows a 15% increase from 2021 to 2023:

2021 (73%) 2022 (88%) 2023 (94%)

New actions taken included an intense focus on math, more hands-on engagement in science inquiry with more emphasis on the scientific process,

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, one potential area of concern is four students with two or more indicators. We will place an intense focus on MTSS for these students focusing on ELA, specifically: morphology, encouraging the students to use morpheme recognition, context, and the dictionary to decipher and/or refine their knowledge of words' meanings; orthography, using a comprehensive scope and sequence that includes instruction in digraphs, blends, silent letter combinations, vowel teams, diphthongs, and guided practice, with more independent practice, and application to reading and writing. Teaching the importance of semantics, where students can comprehend word meanings in relation to other words by using classroom discussion, independent reading, content-area learning, reading aloud, and grouped and independent writing to expose students to new words. Lastly, focusing on syntax and text structure helps students identify how a text hangs together and how to follow the connections among ideas as meaning is constructed.

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

1. Increase the overall ELA school grade from 87% to 90%.
2. Increase the overall math school grade from 88% to 90%.

Small group instruction will be prioritized as it focuses on what students need to learn to move to grade-level proficiency. Teachers will plan, teach, assess, and reteach using diagnostic and classroom unit test results to inform instruction. Coaches will provide professional development on resources created by OCPS to address the BEST standards. A resource library has also been created to facilitate learning and accessibility of resources for teachers. Teachers will continue to be provided with opportunities to learn more about digital tools use, and content to strengthen the students' learning experience. We will continue to monitor the lowest quartile of our students to keep them focused on their learning and provide encouragement for them as they give their best effort.

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.

In order to create a positive culture and environment, Dommerich Elementary will continue to work on providing a supportive and fulfilling learning environment. This environment will meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and ensure a culture that values trust, respect, and high expectations. Our identified area of focus is providing teachers with more feedback. Based on the data of 57% in 2022, we will provide more opportunities for dialogue with teachers in a group or individual setting as well as communicating with grade-level teams during PLC meetings, individual conversations with staff before and after observations or as needed, and leaving complimentary notes once a walkthrough is completed.

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

Based on the Panorama data for staff we have shown a 4-point increase in the area of coaching. However, we would like to show a further increase in this area.

Trended data
2021 53% 2022 57%

Our goal for 2024 is a 3% increase to 60% for 2024.

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

This area will be monitored by bi-annual surveys to assess staff's perception of coaching.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Permenter (laura.permenter@ocps.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.)

The evidence-based intervention will be the instructional feedback given to teachers after observation and a follow-up of recommendations to determine improvement in the identified areas. Observation ratings should show an improvement or further encouragement for improvement. Staff will also be given feedback and opportunities for giving input.

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

This is an objective strategy for providing meaningful, actionable, and timely coaching for teachers. It will be based on what is seen during the classroom visit and quantified with examples of how the teacher achieved the depths of the standards. It will also identify areas of strength and areas for growth. Observations of staff will also include coaching and feedback.

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.

More instructional class walk-throughs and communicating what administrators are looking for during walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Laura Permenter (laura.permenter@ocps.net)

By When: Beginning September 6, 2023.

PLC team feedback

Person Responsible: Laura Permenter (laura.permenter@ocps.net)

By When: August 22, 2023

Coaches coordinating peer observations

Person Responsible: Jody Silvester (jody.silvester@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Seeking input and feedback from staff via bi-annual surveys.

Person Responsible: Janet Martin (janet.martin@ocps.net)

By When: December 15, 2023

#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.

Dommerich Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in the content areas of ELA and math as a result of a review of the 2022-2023 FAST data. The data shows that we decreased 2 points in ELA proficiency. The data also shows that we decreased by 5 points in math proficiency.

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

Increase ELA proficiency from 87% to 90% and Increase math proficiency from 88% to 90%.

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

The school leadership team will be active participants in professional learning community meetings on a weekly basis. This will facilitate additional focus on planning and analyzing data, to determine the progress of students who are not proficient.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Permenter (laura.permenter@ocps.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.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is Evidence-Based Interventions Under the ESSA focusing on the Evidence-Based Decision-Making circle.

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

The rationale for selecting this intervention is to look keenly at how teachers are teaching and how students are learning and identify ways to improve pedagogy and student learning. The strategy will provide a comprehensive review of each child's strengths and needs as well as the teacher's strengths and needs. This will facilitate meaningful conversations with teachers, students, and parents as we review and analyze data to target learning.

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.

Facilitate professional development for teachers to learn the district OCPS structured literacy approach.

Person Responsible: Laura Permenter (laura.permenter@ocps.net)

By When: Beginning in August 2023.

A schedule of all PLC meetings will be created.

Person Responsible: Jody Silvester (jody.silvester@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Data review and analysis of FAST data throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Laura Permenter (laura.permenter@ocps.net)

By When: October 3, 2023

A review of the Evidence-Based Decision-Making circle.

Person Responsible: Laura Permenter (laura.permenter@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

#3. 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.

Based on the review of the 2022-2023 FAST data, the data shows that we decreased 5 points in math proficiency.

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

Increase math proficiency from 88% to 90%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through weekly PLC meetings to plan and analyze data, classroom observations, and attendance to professional development training.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Permenter (laura.permenter@ocps.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.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is targeted instruction in small groups for math using manipulatives as recommended for the Florida BEST math standards.

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

Small group instruction is effective as it focuses precisely on what students need to learn to move forward. Teachers will plan, teach, assess, and reteach. During this cycle, teachers will find skill gaps and adjust instruction as needed.

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.

Facilitate professional development for teachers to learn ways to improve math instruction through the use of manipulatives..

Person Responsible: Laura Permenter (laura.permenter@ocps.net)

By When: Professional development will be conducted throughout the year, with the first math session beginning in August 2023.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				$0.00
2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	1001114500		1181 - Dommerich Elementary	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
			Notes: Professional Development			
3	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction**				**$500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	1001114500		1181 - Dommerich Elementary	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
			Notes: Professional Development			
					Total:	**$1,500.00**

Budget Approval

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

No