Wekiva High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Wekiva High

2501 N HIAWASSEE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

https://wekivahs.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
Williams, Kenisha	Principal	The principal is responsible for all aspects of the day to day operation of the school.
McMiller, Crystal	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for supporting curriculum areas, providing feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices to increase student achievement, and assisting the principal in the day-to-day operation of the school as needed.
Iannuzzi, Kristen	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for supporting curriculum areas, providing feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices to increase student achievement, and assisting the principal in the day-to-day operation of the school as needed.
Joyner, Kristen	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for supporting curriculum areas, providing feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices to increase student achievement, and assisting the principal in the day-to-day operation of the school as needed.

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.

Stakeholders were involved in creating the SIP through the SAC and stakeholder survey completed towards the end of the 2022-2023 year. Information from the survey, which included feedback from faculty, families, and community members, guided us in developing our goals.

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 utilized and reflected in the systems and structures used by the administration to lead PLC members through

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	87%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)* Asian Students (ASN) 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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1007
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	637
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	672
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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	868

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	21

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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*	37	49	50	33	49	51	37		
ELA Learning Gains				41			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			41		
Math Achievement*	25	34	38	21	36	38	16		
Math Learning Gains				36			16		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			22		
Science Achievement*	51	66	64	50	31	40	48		
Social Studies Achievement*	57	66	66	65	43	48	58		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	93	87	89	99	62	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	48	65	65	57	70	67	52		
ELP Progress	36	45	45	49			62		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	93

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	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	529
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	99

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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	35	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	50			
HSP	46			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	48			

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	38	Yes	3	
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	47			
HSP	47			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	45			

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	37			25			51	57		93	48	36
SWD	21			24			25	27		25	6	
ELL	14			11			30	31		25	7	36
AMI												
ASN	81									94	3	
BLK	33			23			45	54		39	7	69
HSP	31			21			52	53		48	7	22
MUL	47			50				90			3	
PAC												
WHT	56			36			64	69		69	6	
FRL	33			22			48	52		49	7	36

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	33	41	30	21	36	48	50	65		99	57	49
SWD	17	32	18	17	37	59	34	34		94	42	
ELL	11	33	26	17	31	42	39	37		98	52	49
AMI												
ASN	73	69						67		100	67	
BLK	31	40	29	17	36	51	52	64		99	49	54
HSP	28	38	30	22	32	43	52	65		98	64	45
MUL	40	47		46	80		80			100	79	
PAC												
WHT	47	48	35	41	39		71	68		98	62	
FRL	26	36	28	18	32	47	49	58		99	56	50

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	37	47	41	16	16	22	48	58		96	52	62
SWD	12	28	26	9	21	22	36	34		90	16	
ELL	9	41	56	18	28	20	39	50		98	46	62
AMI												
ASN	65	67					73	81		100	67	
BLK	32	45	41	11	13	24	39	53		96	41	69
HSP	34	44	43	16	18	20	48	56		96	61	56
MUL	69	79		45						85	55	
PAC												
WHT	52	51	32	29	16	18	65	76		98	65	
FRL	30	42	36	13	14	23	41	55		97	52	63

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
10	2023 - Spring	41%	49%	-8%	50%	-9%
09	2023 - Spring	31%	46%	-15%	48%	-17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	17%	47%	-30%	50%	-33%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	25%	45%	-20%	48%	-23%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	48%	63%	-15%	63%	-15%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	62%	-7%	63%	-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.

The trend from previous year data reveals that the lowest performing area is Algebra 1. Growth is stagnant and while there may be some indications of growth, student performance shows a regression. The contributing factors to the low performance including staffing difficulties (teacher shortage), inconsistencies amongst the PLC members, lack of adherence to instructional focus calendars within the PLC. Instructional support was utilized in common planning sessions and within the PLC.

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

The greatest decline in student performance was seen in US History. The factors contributing to the decline included literacy challenges, including vocabulary that was unfamiliar with them and had not been covered by curriculum resource materials reviewed in class. The student population in this cohort had longstanding challenges with literacy and reading comprehension.

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.

Will answer this question when comparative data for the 22-23 school year is available.

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

The data component that showed the greatest improvement was in English 10. Teacher pedagogy and capacity in regards to standards aligned instructional practices and student monitoring was a focus. Incorporating strong systems and structures in PLC's in combination with frequent actionable feedback on lesson plans and instructional practices. Increased support from content specific instructional coaches and increase accountability on data analysis and instructional shifts based on the needs of individual student groups.

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

N/A

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

Consistency within PLCs, utilizing instructional focus calendars, focusing on opportunities for remediation, small group instruction, and data analysis/chats.

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Teacher retention continues to be a challenge for our school. For two years, we have experienced a high teacher attrition rate in school years 19-20, 20-21, 21-22, and 22-23. Research indicates that consistency in high quality teachers is critical to the success of students. As such, focusing on retaining these high quality teachers needs to be a paramount focus.

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

By the end of the school year, we plan to retain 85% of our staff, thus reducing the amount of teacher attrition in this school.

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

Ultimately the outcome will be seen at the end of the school year along with the results of the annual stakeholder survey. However, continuing efforts to boost morale and address concerns indicated in the stakeholder survey will be made by administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenisha Williams (39017@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.)

Increased amounts of meaningful professional development opportunities that address the specific needs of at-risk populations.

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

In providing teachers these opportunities, we hope to better equip our teachers with pedagogical strategies that will best address the needs of our students and empower teachers.

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.

Conduct a needs assessment with teachers to determine what areas of professional development are most needed and valuable to teachers.

Person Responsible: Kenisha Williams (39017@ocps.net)

By When: October 1, 2023.

Implement professional development sessions and schedule for teachers to participate in.

Person Responsible: Kenisha Williams (39017@ocps.net)

By When: October 13, 2023.

Monitor effectiveness of professional development through classroom observation, teacher survey of perceived effectiveness, and student progress monitoring data

Person Responsible: Kenisha Williams (39017@ocps.net)

By When: December 2023 - May 2024

#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.

Wekiva HS will increase student achievement and decrease the achievement gap by improving teacher instructional capacity with a deeper understanding of the Florida standards and their implementation of effective pedagogical practices.

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

Wekiva will increase student proficiency levels by 5% in ELA, 5% in Math, 5 % in Science and 5% in History and reduce the achievement gap.

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

PLC's and classroom instructional practices will be monitored by administrative team using the classroom walkthrough tool as well as PLC logs and agendas. The trends in data collected will be shared in PLCs and discussed with the administrative team to plan for additional instructional support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenisha Williams (39017@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.)

Collaborative planning and instruction, quality standards aligned instruction. Kagan Strategies, increase use of collaboration strategies.

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

Incorporating structured collaborative planning that standards and aligned with a focus on differentiated instruction we will increase the instructional capacity of all teachers resulting in increases in student academic success.

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.

Collaborative standards aligned common planning in all core content area courses (2 times/week) and provide quarterly departmental PLC day to plan for differentiated instructional support.

Person Responsible: Kenisha Williams (39017@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout 23-24 school year.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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.

Wekiva HS will increase proficiency and achievement in all subgroups by implementing differentiated instruction, utilization of district curriculum resources, targeted small group instruction along with the addition of push in support for students and teachers.

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

Wekiva will see a 10% increase in learning gains in the following categories ELA , Math, and US History. We will increase proficiency and learning gains of our ESSA groups by 7%.

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

Classroom walkthroughs, CRM and PMA assessment data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenisha Williams (39017@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.)

Differentiated instructional practices, collaborative learning, targeted small group instruction.

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

These instructional strategies allow us to individualize instruction for targeted student groups as well as increase the instructional capacity of our teachers. These changes will increase student performance in all content areas.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

To ensure school improvement funding allocations are supporting the student subgroups that are consistently underperforming at Wekiva, specifically our ESE student population, we have hired support facilitators to push into classes and address student needs. In addition to the support facilitators that assist our ESE students, the school has been provided with various resources designed to increase student achievement in our lowest performing subgroups. The resources we are utilizing in classrooms include SIPPS, IXL math, and IXL English. Administration meets regularly to review the data in order to evaluate the successes or failures of the programs and interventions that are implemented.

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.

Publishing on the school website (https://wekivahs.ocps.net/), highlighting the SIP goals during SAC meetings

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))

Wekiva High School is committed to building a positive school culture and environment. 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 stakeholder groups to
employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment is critical.
Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Alums and community stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, colleges and universities, social services, and business partners. The administration regularly meets with students across grade levels and subgroups to meet with Dr. Williams to offer their concerns, input, feelings, and reflections on school safety, student voice, quality of instruction, resources, extracurricular activities, and overall perspective of their high school experience. Teachers, staff, and stakeholders are crucial in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, and goals and employing school improvement strategies. During SAC meetings, parent conferences, and parent surveys, our community's thoughts, concerns, and needs.

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))

Wekiva High School will increase the amount and quality of learning time by implementing opportunities for acceleration by identifying students interested in magnet, CTE, and accelerated curriculums. School counselors will assist in identifying these students.

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