
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Wolf Lake Middle

1725 W PONKAN RD, Apopka, FL 32712

<https://wolflakems.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Haupt

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Wolf Lake Middle

1725 W PONKAN RD, Apopka, FL 32712

<https://wolflakems.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>56%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>63%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and communities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Campbell, Marion	Assistant Principal	
Schmidt, Danielle	Instructional Coach	
Sizer, Robin	Dean	
Ius, Patricia	Assistant Principal	
Carter, Shannon	Instructional Coach	
Jackson, Sheila	Instructional Media	
Six, Christina	Teacher, ESE	
Palmer, Marcus	Dean	
Plotkin, Lisa	Dean	
Washington, Luther	Other	
Haupt, Cynthia	Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	473	441	489	0	0	0	0	1403
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	69	61	0	0	0	0	203
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	49	33	0	0	0	0	148
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	141	68	0	0	0	0	307
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	164	162	0	0	0	0	464

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	133	78	0	0	0	0	319

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/1/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	45	63	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	51	72	0	0	0	0	173
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	55	87	0	0	0	0	211
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	173	141	133	0	0	0	0	447

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	71	93	0	0	0	0	261

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	45	63	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	51	72	0	0	0	0	173
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	55	87	0	0	0	0	211
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	173	141	133	0	0	0	0	447

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	71	93	0	0	0	0	261

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	52%	54%	54%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	52%	54%	52%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	45%	47%	38%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	54%	55%	58%	53%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	49%	55%	57%	54%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	50%	51%	41%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	52%	51%	51%	52%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	67%	72%	78%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	473 (0)	441 (0)	489 (0)	1403 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	73 (73)	69 (45)	61 (63)	203 (181)
One or more suspensions	66 (50)	49 (51)	33 (72)	148 (173)
Course failure in ELA or Math	98 (69)	141 (55)	68 (87)	307 (211)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	138 (173)	164 (141)	162 (133)	464 (447)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
06	2019	56%	52%	4%	54%	2%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	48%	0%	52%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	51%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	41%	43%	-2%	55%	-14%
	2018	32%	35%	-3%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	49%	2%	54%	-3%
	2018	57%	51%	6%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
08	2019	36%	36%	0%	46%	-10%
	2018	43%	32%	11%	45%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	50%	49%	1%	48%	2%
	2018	51%	49%	2%	50%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	66%	6%	71%	1%
2018	74%	66%	8%	71%	3%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	63%	8%	61%	10%
2018	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%
2018	86%	65%	21%	56%	30%
Compare		8%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	9	33	32	13	31	28	16	26			
ELL	23	36	32	25	37	34	19	37	57		
ASN	75	70		79	65		67		100		
BLK	45	46	43	40	38	32	39	69	67		
HSP	44	48	33	45	48	39	51	65	70		
MUL	59	39		79	68			79	80		
WHT	66	54	41	70	59	53	65	81	82		
FRL	40	45	37	41	42	38	39	66	65		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	33	34	12	36	31	10	36			
ELL	9	31	35	18	37	36	10	41			
ASN	68	64		80	77			73	100		
BLK	45	47	39	43	47	40	45	74	74		
HSP	41	44	42	48	51	40	39	69	84		
MUL	50	43		65	43		45	90			
WHT	64	53	48	66	53	35	64	79	77		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
FRL	42	45	40	45	46	36	44	68	77		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	6	28	29	12	39	35	18	33			
ELL	11	30	35	16	40	33	20	41			
ASN	74	65		89	73				93		
BLK	43	43	29	40	45	38	39	73	61		
HSP	45	49	33	45	55	42	41	69	72		
MUL	60	61		53	45		82	70	75		
WHT	65	59	53	66	60	45	63	87	83		
FRL	40	45	35	40	47	39	37	68	68		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	539
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Overall, proficiency in ELA within the Lowest 25th percentile represented the lowest data point in 2019, at 39%. This achievement level declined from 41% in 2018. This is currently not a trend as the lowest data point was in Mathematics of the Lowest 25th percentile in 2018. However, the trend can be among the Lowest 25th percentile subgroup. One of the contributing factors to this could be a substitute in one grade level for intensive reading due to the teacher being on medical leave for 7 months of the school year.

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

Overall, there were three data points that declined by two percentage points from the previous year. ELA Lowest 25th percentile dropped 2 percentage points from 41% to 39%. Overall Math Learning Gains dropped from 51% to 49% and Social Studies Achievement dropped from 75% to 73% (however, this score still exceeds the state and district average). One of the contributing factors to this could be a substitute in one grade level for intensive reading due to the teacher being on medical leave for 7 months of the school year. The Math contributing factor to the decline in learning gains could be attributed to 2 of the 8th grade teachers beginning after the school year began and one of those going out on a medical leave.

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.

Overall, learning gains in Mathematics for the lowest 25th percentile was 41%, representing the biggest gap of 10% when compared to the state average of 51%. This was also the area with the largest noted gap compared to the state average in 2018. The Math contributing factor to the decline in learning gains could be attributed to 2 of the 8th grade teachers beginning after the school year began and one of those going out on a medical leave.

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

Overall, Mathematics learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile showed the most gains with a 2% increase. No new actions were taken this past school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Overall, the two potential areas of concern are the number of 6th grade students who failed a course in ELA or Math grew from 69 to 141, and the number of students who received a Level 1 on a statewide assessment with current 8th graders grew from 141 to 161.

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

1. Learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile in Mathematics
2. Learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile in ELA

3. Proficiency with SWD

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Increase ELA and Math Proficiency by increasing Learning Gains in the Lowest Quartile.
Rationale	The data shows that students in the lowest quartile in Math and ELA dropped in the 2018-2019 school year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By increasing the rigor of standards based instruction, learning gains in the lowest quartile in ELA will increase from 39% to 44%. Learning gains in the lowest quartile in Math will increase from 41% to 44%
---	---

Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cynthia Haupt (cynthia.haupt@ocps.net)
--	--

Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will implement standards based instruction with the use of the rotational model with the focus of the small group teacher led rotation being data based in our intensive classes. This will be monitored through lesson plan review and classroom walkthrough evidence.
--------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If the rotational model is used it can focus in on the specific needs of our lowest quartile in Reading and Math. By continually looking at data points and using them to lead instruction we will instruct students to their specific needs in both academic areas.
--	--

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with common planning time facilitated by a leadership team member (coach or administration) to build standards- based, data driven ELA and Math lessons. 2. DPLC site team members will facilitate the growth and development of teachers with the understanding and implementation of the close reading strategies using rigorous texts. (DPLC site team) 3. Provide teachers with professional development on close reading strategies and writing across the curriculum. (Carter) 4. Provide instructional feedback from monitoring and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data. 5. Teachers will meet regularly after data points have been taken to ensure that small, teacher led groups are data based and the instruction within those groups are standards based.
--------------------	--

Person Responsible	Cynthia Haupt (cynthia.haupt@ocps.net)
---------------------------	--

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Wolf Lake Middle continues to make consistent efforts to create positive relationships with students, families, and members of our community. Parents are updated with a weekly phone call home through the School Messenger phone system. Parents are notified of the many activities that take place during the week and are notified of upcoming events. This phone call recognizes student accomplishments and thanks community members for their ongoing support. In addition, a selected group of parents receive weekly phone calls about missing student work as needed. In an effort to continue to create school and community pride, WLMS actively maintains a social media presence, keeping followers informed of events, activities, and accomplishments of both students and our staff. Additionally, our "text to connect" email newsletter is sent to the inboxes of our parents and community members each week. Progress reports and report cards are sent home every four weeks to keep parents informed of their students' academic progress. Our school hosts a 6th Grade Orientation event to welcome parents and students at the beginning of the school year. Parents are welcomed on campus and are encouraged to contact teachers to arrange meetings as needed to address questions and concerns and to discuss student progress.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Students are encouraged to communicate with any adult on campus regarding any challenges that they may be experiencing. Several staff members have been trained in Ruby Payne strategies to increase their awareness of the impact generational poverty has on students. Counselors and grade level administrators routinely counsel students. A SAFE Coordinator has been recruited and hired to provide counseling and to facilitate accessing social services. WLMS offers social skills classes which help build social capital in select students. Additionally, SEDNET offers a network of professional counseling for students in need. MCUSA sponsors a motivational coach, who is housed on campus. The school's MARVEL program provides personal growth support through mentoring for young men identified as struggling with academic and behavioral expectations. The mentoring program for young women is named Wonder Women, which provides similar experiences with female role models. Students identified as possibly benefiting from one-on-one mentoring relationships are assigned a staff mentor by the SAFE coordinator. Staff members volunteer to work with students with whom they have established positive relationships. Sixth grade students are offered a transition class, called Wolf class, where they learn strategies for time management, study skills, and academic support.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

- Wolf Camp - an orientation to middle school for rising 6th grade students and parents.
- Summer School - a program in which students have the opportunity to earn grade-level recovery for courses not passed during the school year, ensuring that all students meet the requirements to transition to high school.
- 8th Grade High School Orientation - an evening where outgoing 8th grade students and parents are invited to WLMS for an orientation to prepare to attend Apopka High School.
- AVID College Visitations - AVID students will have an opportunity to take a field trip to several colleges and universities.
- Visit feeder elementary school to collect information regarding incoming sixth graders.
- Wolf Pack Welcome- incoming sixth grade students visit and tour the campus in May.
- Collaborate with high school counselors for scheduling of our outgoing 8th graders.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Wolf Lake Middle School identifies personnel and instructional staff as resources to meet the needs of all students. Professional Learning Communities meet every week. The PLC's analyze data derived from iReady, common assessments, and teacher observations. This data analysis process allows necessary instructional adjustments to provide intervention and enrichment opportunities that meet a variety of student needs. Academic intervention is provided through intensive reading and math classes. Instructional staff also work on department teams which meet monthly to collaborate on the expectations and demands of specific content areas. Each department lead teacher meets monthly with the leadership team to review progress on school improvement goals and to determine what instructional adjustments need to be made in order to continue improvement. The administrative leadership team meets weekly to address school-wide issues as they arise and to review data and share information from the members' respective areas of responsibility which include exceptional education, safety and discipline, guidance, media and instructional support.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

WLMS incorporates a career-planning component into the 8th grade social studies curriculum. Students in all grades will have the opportunity to visit colleges and universities through the AVID program. Guidance counselors will provide college and career choice advice and assistance in 6th, 7th and 8th grade classes.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA and Math Proficiency by increasing Learning Gains in the Lowest Quartile.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00