S. S. Dixon Intermediate School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

S. S. Dixon Intermediate School

5540 EDUCATION DR, Pace, FL 32571

http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/ssdi/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/12/2023.

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.

S.S. Dixon Intermediate believes each child is special and unique. We desire to provide a positive, safe, and stimulating educational environment that inspires and encourages a love of learning so that all children can achieve their personal best and become independent life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

S. S. Dixon Intermediate School is committed to providing multiple pathways towards excellence and achievement in an effort to develop a well-rounded, confident, and responsible student who aspires to achieve their fullest potential, so they have the necessary life skills to be successful.

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
Arrant, Sandra	Principal	Provide leadership for all aspects of the school. Make sure all efforts are made to keep the campus safe. Create a positive environment for students, staff, and families. Incorporate community members into school-wide decisions. Incorporate STEAM into classrooms school wide. Lead and coach teachers with Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction. Promoting and managing school clubs and committees. Leading the School Advisory Council. Overseeing the PTSO. Monitoring the Intervention Program and MTSS meetings. Building an Intentional Master Schedule to meet the needs of students.
Clarke, Andrew	School Counselor	Facilitates the MTSS process. Meets with individual and small groups of students who exhibit concerns/issues. Develops 504 for identified students. Serves as McKinney Vento contact. Organizes and arranges FAST Testing-trains teachers, distributes/collects testing materials, serves as contact. Completes IQ testing, paperwork for possible ADHD diagnosis for parents to take to doctors,and inputs data for diagnostic testing. Monitors child abuse training completion.
Teschel, Terri	Instructional Coach	Serves as the Lead Math Interventionist. Provides leadership in the area of math. Works closely with administration to monitor data and determine students in need of math interventions. Serves as member of Multi-tiered Systems of Support Team: helps teachers create hypotheses and monitors data in the PMP. Serves as math contact; attends district meetings and shares information with our staff. Works with administration to create and monitor tutoring program for math. Works in small group to remediate missing skills for struggling students. Develops and works with students on our competitive math team. Works with instructional staff to improve academic achievement.
Austin, Mandy	Instructional Coach	Provides leadership in the area of reading. Serves as ELA contact. Works closely with administration to monitor data and determine students in need of intensive reading interventions. Serves as member of Multi-tiered Systems of Support Team; helps teachers create hypotheses and monitors data in the PMP. Develops schedules for paraprofessionals who work with struggling readers. Works with administration to create and monitor tutoring program for reading. Works in small group to remediate missing skills for struggling students. Works with instructional staff to improve academic achievement.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Faust, Gretchen	Instructional Media	School Media Specialist. Digital Coach. AR/ STAR Specialist. Sunshine State Books Specialist. Literacy Night Coordinator. Standards based reading/library skills teacher. PBIS Committee member.
Webb, Tina	Behavior Specialist	PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) coach. Responsible for supporting all (PBIS) initiatives and training, to include, providing support in implementation activities, and collection, analysis and reporting of data. Leads Behavior MTSS process. Consults effectively with students, parents, teachers, and other school staff to promote student success and provides a supportive and positive atmosphere. Ensure school rules are uniformly observed and that student discipline is appropriate and equitable.
Ellis, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	Serves as the Title 1 Interventionist. Provides leadership in the area of reading and math. Works closely with administration to monitor data and determine Title 1 students in need of reading and math interventions. Serves as member of Multi-tiered Systems of Support Team: helps teachers create hypotheses and monitors data in the PMP. Works with administration to create and monitor tutoring program for reading and math. Works in small group to remediate missing skills for targeted students (lowest quartile students). Develops and works with students on our competitive math team. Works with instructional staff to improve academic achievement.
Lancieri, Tonya	Assistant Principal	Assists with daily school processes and procedures. Monitors and maintains safety on campus. Oversees facilities maintenance requests. Provides training on safety related topics and student safety education through frequent drills. Promotes the PBIS program, a student discipline management system that results in positive student behavior. Ensures school rules are uniformly observed and that student discipline is appropriate and equitable. Maintains Title 1 Crate for Federal Programs.

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.

On July 25, 2023 Administration, along with members from our SAC (Mitzi Flanders, Melissa Foles, Erika Cooper, and Melanie Schapp) analyzed our school's student data to determine areas in need of growth in reading, math and science. Administration also met with the SSDI Leadership Team and shared decisions made with our SAC members to review the areas of need and then determine strategies and action plan to implement and improve student achievement in the Focus Areas.

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))

Administration, Leadership Team and SAC will continuously monitor school data after Progress Monitoring windows and throughout the year through MTSS meetings. We will review the data quarterly and report findings to the district's Continuous Improvement Department. When areas are not making adequate progress, the SIP will be revised to increase student achievement.

Each semester the principal and assistant principal will meet with District leaders to include the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, Grade Level Director, Literacy/Math/Science Coordinators and the Director and Coordinator of Continuous Improvement. The purpose of the meeting will be o review current state progress monitoring data and to progress monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Strategies and Action Steps. Specific feedback will be provided and discussion will occur as to any barriers in applying the strategies of the plan.

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 3-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	19%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	28	31	32	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	9	5	8	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	13	14	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	9	21	22	0	0	0	52

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	37	41	40	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	7	5	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	5	9	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	31	31	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	36	29	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	45	24	0	0	0	87

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	7	21	17	0	0	0	45

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	3	5	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	37	41	40	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	7	5	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	5	9	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	31	31	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	36	29	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	45	24	0	0	0	87

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	7	21	17	0	0	0	45

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	3	5	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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*	69	62	53	69	65	56	67		
ELA Learning Gains				67			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			41		
Math Achievement*	74	68	59	73	45	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				68			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			59		
Science Achievement*	60	57	54	56	68	59	61		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		77	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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	276
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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
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	40	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	56			
HSP	68			
MUL	75			
PAC				

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%
WHT	69			
FRL	58			

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	45			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	66			
HSP	52			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	56			

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	69			74			60					
SWD	44			42			18				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	76			86							2	
BLK	52			60							2	
HSP	75			68			50				4	

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
MUL	67			70			72				4	
PAC												
WHT	68			75			60				4	
FRL	59			63			45				4	

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	69	67	51	73	68	54	56					
SWD	43	53	38	47	57	43	31					
ELL	45			64								
AMI												
ASN	81	80		94	100							
BLK	61	70		61	73							
HSP	60	53	29	62	63	40	54					
MUL	73	67		65	65	42	59					
PAC												
WHT	70	68	50	75	69	55	57					
FRL	57	61	53	61	62	52	44					

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	67	49	41	74	66	59	61					
SWD	42	41	36	52	51	45	36					
ELL	42			42								
AMI												
ASN	57			71								
BLK	63			58								
HSP	63	43		77	64		65					
MUL	74	64		79	82		67					
PAC												
WHT	67	48	40	74	65	61	60					

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
FRL	52	47	44	58	64	57	54					

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	72%	64%	8%	54%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	68%	3%	58%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	61%	12%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	63%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	75%	70%	5%	59%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	72%	5%	61%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	74%	63%	11%	55%	19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	55%	4%	51%	8%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Based on data that is currently available for the 2022-23 FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking) and FCAT (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test) our proficiency levels are above the 41% federal index threshold in ELA (English Language Arts), math, and science. However, our science data remains the lowest of the three areas. Our 2022-23 science proficiency level is 59%, which means 41% of our students are still scoring below proficiency.

Due to LG (learning gains) and accountability components by subgroup not being calculated at this time for 2022-23 school year state assessments, we also evaluated 2021-22 assessment data. While we did see an overall increase in math learning gains by 2 points (66% to 68%), our overall achievement levels in math dropped 1 point (74% to 73%) and our lowest 25th percentile in math also dropped by 5 points (59% to 54%). Additionally, our science achievement levels for 5th grade SWD (students with disabilities) subgroup was 31%, which fell below the federal index of 41%.

Contributing factors to these lower performing components were learning gaps students still have due to COVID quarantines, the inconsistency of small group instruction with the basal curriculum, the inconsistency of rigorous higher-order questioning compared to questioning that is used on the state testing platforms, and adapting to an entirely new state testing platform.

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

Due to data components not being calculated at this time for progress monitoring we evaluated 2021-22 data and noticed the data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was our lowest 25th percentile in math which decreased 4 points (59% to 54%).

Factors that contributed to this component showing the greatest decline from the prior year were learning gaps students still have due to COVID quarantines, the inconsistency of small group instruction with the basal curriculum, the inconsistency of rigorous higher-order questioning compared to questioning that is used on the state testing platforms, and adapting to an entirely new state testing platform.

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.

When analyzing SSDI's data, our third-grade students scored at 73% proficiency compared to the state's average of 50% proficiency in the area of ELA. This is our greatest gap when comparing SSDI's data to the state's average.

Factors that contributed to our students scoring above the state average were teacher's using learning targets and scales to track student progress as each standard was taught. Students struggling on a standard were pulled into small groups for additional reading instruction and practice in the area(s) needed. Weekly assessments were tracked to ensure that students were mastering areas of concern. Students also practiced areas of concern using Freckle, an online computer based program to support reading instruction. Data chats were held within each grade level to discuss intention reading strategies and instruction to improve overall student performance.

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

When comparing our 2021-22 FSA and FCAT proficiency levels to our 2022-23 proficiency levels we saw a 3-point increase in math (73% to 76%), ELA (69% to 72%), and science (56% to 59%). Due to accountability components by subgroups data for the 2022-23 assessments not being calculated at this time we evaluated this subgroup data for the 2021-22 school year and noticed our ELA learning gains showed the most improvement. Overall, there was a 13-point increase (49% in 2020-21 to 67% in 2021-22).

To accelerate our students' learning, we used Freckle Reading, evidence-based intervention programs, and HMH ELA curriculum and assessments. We encouraged teachers to use computer-based assessments so students were familiar with online testing platforms. STAR and Progress Monitoring reading reports were monitored frequently for mastery of standards. Additionally, we had quarterly data chats with teachers where we discussed students not mastering standards and provided additional support to teachers if needed. Our ELA Intervention teachers provided professional development for teachers on standards-based instruction, small group instruction, and curriculum components. Our master schedule was designed so that our ESE students were receiving appropriate levels of support and our ESE teachers had common planning times where they could discuss strategies for our struggling ESE population. Furthermore, our MTSS team monitored students needing intervention and provided intervention to students who were not showing growth and learning gains.

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

One area of potential concern is the number of students absent 10% or more days. Our data reveals 91 students in grades third-fifth (90%).

Another area of concern is the number of students listed on our EWS data that scored a level one on the statewide ELA assessment (65 students, grades third-fifth) and math assessment (66 students, grades third-fifth).

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, Administration will use the Marzano evaluation tool and professional learning communities to provide clear expectations on proper use of classroom rubrics and scales. The Marzano evaluation tool will also be used to provide effective feedback during classroom observations so teachers can strengthen their tier 1 instruction to include high rigor, utilizing research-based instructional strategies.

Another priority, SSDI will focus on is the school-wide implementation of CHAMPS so that classroom and schoolwide behavior expectations are established, and students are motivated to put forth their best efforts. CHAMPs is a research-based behavior platform that helps to establish clear- precise behavior expectations and will correlate with our PBIS programs to ensure a conducive learning environment.

The final area, SSDI will focus on will be to implement effective benchmark-aligned instruction to improve the academic achievement of the students. Through grade level meetings, data chats, progress monitoring and collaboration among all stakeholders, our school will focus on ensuring a strong instruction at the tier 1 level and intensive intervention when needed for tier 2 and tier 3 groups.

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.

After reviewing our school referral data, it was revealed that our classroom referrals were higher than the expectations of our school given that we are a PBIS school. For the 2022-2023 school year, Dixon Intermediate had a total of 100 school referrals and 41 Behavior PMPs.
Implementing a PLC focusing on CHAMPs, a research-based behavior program, will assist with procedures and expectations to improve the learning environment for all students and assist with teacher retention.

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

Short Term: After year one of implementation with 25% (12 teachers) of our staff being trained in CHAMPs and implementation is done with fidelity, we will decrease our overall classroom referrals by 5% (95 referrals).

Long Term: In 3 years, our goal is to have 100% of the staff trained in CHAMPs and discipline referrals decreased.

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

Administration, the Leadership Team and the PBIS committee will monitor classroom discipline data and student behavior plans. The PBIS committee will monitor monthly school-wide trend data. The Leadership Team will monitor weekly student data and assist teachers with effective strategies and progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.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 evidence-based strategy that we will implement to help decrease our overall referrals is CHAMPS. CHAMPS is an evidence-based approach to classroom behavior management. CHAMPS is not a curriculum or program, but instead is a collection of recommendations that are based on more than 30 years of research in the fields of education and psychology. Evidence for CHAMPS can be found at https://www.safeandcivilschools.com/research/references/is-champs-evidence-based.pdf

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

This strategy complements our PBIS initiatives for a school-wide approach to positive behavior support and aligns to our PRIDE (Prepared, Respectful, Integrity, Do your best, and Everyone matters) expectations. Safe and Civil Schools has many examples of district-based studies where CHAMPS has been implemented with remarkable results. Improvements include reductions in classroom disruptions, office referrals, and in-school and out-of-school suspensions, along with corresponding increases in teachers' perceptions of efficacy and student motivation and behavior.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Form a PLC for all teachers who have not yet been trained in CHAMPS implementation.

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: By June 2024, 25% (12 teachers) will be formally trained in the research-based behavior management program, CHAMPs.

CHAMPS PLC will meet monthly

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

PLC facilitator will turn in agendas and minutes to the principal.

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

PBIS team will monitor and analyze referral data and make suggestions for improvement.

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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 school demographic data and the number of new teachers at Dixon Intermediate (15 new instructional teachers), another area of focus will be strengthening Tier 1 instruction in all content areas across all grade levels.

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

Short Term: By participating in professional development focusing on Marzano's Learning Targets and Performance Scales and The Power of Student Led Teams, teachers will increase their instructional practice, which in turn will increase Tier 1 instruction in all content areas. As a result, our tier 1 instruction will improve, and student proficiency will increase in the areas of reading and math by 4%.

Long Term: Over the next three years, the PLCs will continue to focus on Marzano's Essential for Achieving Rigor Series devoted to implementing indicators that will increase coaching through walkthroughs and classroom observations. Another area of focus will be Professional Development in Student Led Teams. Teacher observations will reflect a minimum of 50% at mid-year and 75% at the end of the year in the area of teachers delivering explicit benchmark-aligned instruction. FAST Data will reflect a minimum of 50% of students proficient in all content areas.

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

The school leadership team will review student data to provide support and feedback to teachers. Academic coaches will be available to support the development of explicit, intentional instructional practices that align with state standards. The leadership team will look for trend data and adjust professional development as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.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.)

According to the article, How Professional Learning Communities Lead to Improve Student Outcomes, "By cultivating supportive conditions, the faculty who are engaged will be able to work in an environment that is in a continuous learning cycle that utilizes innovation and experimentation to improve their professional practice" (Nenonene, Gallagher, Kelly, & Collopy, 2019) (1). In order to increase benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms, we will participate in a PLC focusing on effectively implementing the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model framework which "provides a methodology to support teacher growth as teacher make instructional shifts necessary to support students in rigorous standards-based classrooms" (2). The model draws upon data from field research and validation studies, coupled with findings from the extant literature on rigorous, standards-based instruction (3).

(1) https://learningally.org/Portals/6/Docs/Professional-Learning/
LAPLS_CommunitiesWhitepaper.pdf?ver=2021-01-08-134918-053

(2) http://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/10/MC06-14-FTEM-White-Paper-1-16-18-Digital-4.pdf

(3) http://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/FTEM Updated Michigan 08312017.pdf

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

Through this evidence-based intervention, "PLCs connect educators with similar goals and challenges and provide a space for efficient and effective planning and reflection that has been shown to improve educator performance and student outcomes (1). The PLC focusing on the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model is supported by research and demonstrates significantly increased student growth scores (2). The model has four domains focusing on teacher planning, standards-based planning and instruction, aligning directly to Area of Focus.

(1) https://learningally.org/Portals/6/Docs/Professional-Learning/ LAPLS_CommunitiesWhitepaper.pdf?ver=2021-01-08-134918-053

(2) http://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/FTEM Updated Michigan 08312017.pdf

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Instructional Training on Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Tool to ensure an understanding of expectations.

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Pre-planning (Aug. 2023)

The Leadership team will meet to review student data and review trends in observation data, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans and feedback from admin and coaches.

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Form PLCs focusing on Marzano's Essential for Achieving Rigor series and The Power of Student Teams meeting monthly to increase student achievement and instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Academic Coaches along with administration will facilitate grade-level planning and provide support on how to develop benchmark-aligned lessons.

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

#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 preliminary data (2021-2022 data), our school-wide data results revealed a decrease in proficiency in the area of math achievement on the FSA Math spring assessment (overall 73% proficient), specifically in lowest quartile dropping to 54%. There was also a decrease in science achievement on the Pearson Science spring assessment by 5% points (from 61% to 56%).

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

Short Term: Walkthroughs data will increase 50% mid-year and 75% at the end of the year in the area of teachers delivering explicit benchmark-aligned instruction. FAST data will reflect a minimum of 55% our students proficient in all areas.

Long Term: FAST data will reflect an increase in student proficiency in the area of math, specifically in the lowest quartile by 5%. Also, Pearson Science will show an increase in student proficiency by 5%.

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

Administration and the school's leadership team will monitor instructional practices through grade level meetings, data chats, progress monitoring assessments and during MTSS meetings. Also, through collaboration with ESE teachers and Interventionist, classroom teachers will make instructional adjustments based on student progress and data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.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.)

In order to increase benchmark-align instruction in our classrooms, a "strong culture of data use, conveyed through a clear schoolwide vision, that is critical to ensure that data-based decisions are made routinely, consistently, and effectively" must be implemented routinely (1). As teachers, the leadership team and admin meet regularly to analyze data and instructional decisions will be implemented to ensure student achievement and academic growth.

(1) What Works Clearinghouse: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/ dddm_pg_092909.pdf#page=33

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

According to What Works Clearinghouse, "As educators face increasing pressure from federal, state, and local accountability policies to improve student achievement, the use of data has become more central to how many educators evaluate their practices and monitor students' academic progress" (1). By analyzing data, discussing trends seen and making instructional changes to meet students' needs, our instructional staff will ensure the students have the opportunity to receive quality instruction and meet grade level expectations.

(1)What Works Clearinghouse: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/dddm_pg_092909.pdf

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Academic Coaches and Admin will facilitate grade -level planning and provide support on how to develop benchmark-aligned instruction.

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Leadership team and admin will meet to review trends in student data, classroom observations and monitor student performance during MTSS meetings.

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

PLCs focusing on benchmark-aligned instructional practices (Marzano's Learning Targets and Performance Scales and The Power of Student Teams).

Person Responsible: Sandra Arrant (arrants@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

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.

SSDI will disseminate the SIP plan to stakeholders, families, school staff, and local businesses through the school website, a newsletter, Title 1 Annual Parent Meeting and Open House. The SIP plan will also be shared during the School Advisory Council meeting at the beginning of the school year. Our SIP will be shared with our staff during a faculty meeting. A copy will be provided in our Title 1 Binder that is housed in our Parent Resource Room.

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))

SSDI plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders throughout the school year by hosting parent and family events. Some of the events will be our: Title 1 Annual Parent Open House Night, Family Academic Engagement Activity Night, Family Fun Night, Veteran's Day Assembly, Book Fair Literacy Nights, and a STEAM event, Call-outs, newsletters, and SAC meetings.

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))

Our school plans to strengthen the academic program by increasing a strong culture of data use and improving the academic rigor through daily instruction. By meeting with admin and the leadership team, teachers will use data to ensure benchmark-aligned instruction is given routinely, consistently, and effectively to increase student academic achievement.

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