Williston Middle High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Williston Middle High School

350 SW 12 AVE, Williston, FL 32696

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

Demographics

Principal: Emily Hancock

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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

Williston Middle High School

350 SW 12 AVE, Williston, FL 32696

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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.

Our mission at Williston Middle High School is to build character, advance knowledge, and prepare our students to be community, college, career and society ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every Student, Every Day. College, Career, Community, and Society Ready.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Slemp, Joshua	Principal	The Principal along with the Assistant Principals oversees academic growth and school safety. Administration uses collaborative processes for faculty to work together to improve instruction and ensures that professional development is ongoing throughout the school year. Every meeting administration holds with faculty, data is the focus and the driving force for discussions,professional development, and instruction design. Through walk-throughs and formal observations,administration provides feedback and tailors professional development to the individual needs of the teachers.
Dola, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Our reading coaches support our teachers by providing push-in support, pull data, provide small group and whole group professional development and model best instructional practices in their model classrooms for one period everyday. Reading Coaches also provide leadership for our Problem Solving Teams (PST) which are held 1 every nine weeks and identify any students of concern from our EWS data.
Westfall, Dorenda	Assistant Principal	Administration uses collaborative processes for faculty to work together to improve instruction and ensures that professional development is ongoing throughout the school year. Every meeting administration holds with faculty, data is the focus and the driving force for discussions, professional development, and instruction design. Through walk-throughs and formal observations, administration provides feedback and tailors professional development to the individual needs of the teachers.
Philpot, Amber	Instructional Coach	Our reading coaches support our teachers by providing push-in support, pull data, provide small group and whole group professional development and model best instructional practices in their model classrooms for one period everyday. Reading Coaches also provide leadership for our Problem Solving Teams (PST) which are held 1 every nine weeks and identify any students of concern from our EWS data.
Davis , Catherine	Teacher, K-12	Lead team members meet with administration monthly and provide input based on their content area/grade levels. Lead team members also meet back with their respective teams and provide professional development and/or support each other with lesson planning.
Smith, James	Dean	Support admin and teachers in their roles with behavioral supports and strategies. Our deans also offer input and ideas to help our struggling students by established relationships.
Handley, Jennifer	Administrative Support	Testing coordinators oversee all testing on the campus for the school year. The coordinator runs reports to ensure all students needing initial and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		retake tests are given the opportunity. The coordinator makes sure our school follows state and district testing procedures and completes all required testing documents with security in mind.
Warren, Karen	School Counselor	The guidance counselor's role is to provide supports for our students with their academic choices, social emotional and mental health issues. Our guidance department coordinates additional support services with our designated licensed mental health professional. Mrs. Warren in addition supports our 11th and 12th graders as a graduation coach assuring our seniors have required credits in order to graduate on time. Guidance provides supports to our parents acting as a liaison between them and their child's teachers. Guidance roles are multifaceted in the well being of all of our students, making sure students with IEPs, 504s and ELLs have a voice and support in the classroom. The guidance department provides resources to our students in all areas that effect their ability to be a productive student.
Hawkins, Benjamin	Assistant Principal	Administration uses collaborative processes for faculty to work together to improve instruction and ensures that professional development is ongoing throughout the school year. Every meeting administration holds with faculty, data is the focus and the driving force for discussions, professional development, and instruction design. Through walk-throughs and formal observations, administration provides feedback and tailors professional development to the individual needs of the teachers.
Myhree, Amanda	Dean	Support admin and teachers in their roles with behavioral supports and strategies. Our deans also offer input and ideas to help our struggling students by established relationships.
Couey, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	Lead team members meet with administration monthly and provide input based on their content area/grade levels. Lead team members also meet back with their respective teams and provide professional development and/or support each other with lesson planning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Emily Hancock

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
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](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	203	168	156	151	130	135	1082
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	5	1	4	4	1	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	55	65	57	58	32	29	353
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	14	80	72	29	24	22	280
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	36	30	47	33	24	19	225
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	33	37	36	33	21	0	184

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	21	42	44	28	17	11	193

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	14	0	0	6	1	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	13	9	11	3	1	52

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/28/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	192	178	150	145	135	151	103	1054
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	38	48	23	38	38	18	249

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	0	120	131	128	112	127	77	695

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	16	28	12	0	0	13	0	69
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	2	0	0	6	0	22

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	192	178	150	145	135	151	103	1054
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	34	42	36	33	50	41	277
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	52	36	25	30	19	25	256
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	27	50	26	14	10	5	167
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	38	48	23	38	38	18	249

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	0	120	131	128	112	127	77	695

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	16	28	12	0	0	13	0	69
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	2	0	0	6	0	22

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	42%	0%	56%	36%	0%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	0%	51%	38%	0%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	0%	42%	35%	0%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	51%	0%	51%	47%	0%	49%
Math Learning Gains	48%	0%	48%	48%	0%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	0%	45%	33%	0%	39%
Science Achievement	52%	0%	68%	43%	0%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	0%	73%	66%	0%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	42%	41%	1%	54%	-12%
	2018	25%	35%	-10%	52%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	29%	37%	-8%	52%	-23%
	2018	32%	41%	-9%	51%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	25%	36%	-11%	56%	-31%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	58%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
09	2019	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%
	2018	42%	40%	2%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
10	2019	50%	50%	0%	53%	-3%
	2018	39%	38%	1%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	45%	3%	55%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	38%	41%	-3%	52%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	47%	55%	-8%	54%	-7%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	54%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	31%	29%	2%	46%	-15%
	2018	21%	38%	-17%	45%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	38%	43%	-5%	48%	-10%
	2018	50%	44%	6%	50%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	62%	66%	-4%	67%	-5%
2018	58%	58%	0%	65%	-7%
Compare		4%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	65%	72%	-7%	71%	-6%
2018	70%	73%	-3%	71%	-1%
Compare		-5%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	69%	68%	1%	70%	-1%
2018	60%	66%	-6%	68%	-8%
Compare		9%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	57%	7%	61%	3%
2018	44%	44%	0%	62%	-18%
Compare		20%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	53%	-1%	57%	-5%
2018	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
Compare		6%			

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	20	46	43	29	40	27	32	50		70	14
ELL	29	48	42	37	32	53	36	29			
BLK	22	44	45	29	34	24	24	51		86	67
HSP	36	41	36	43	37	44	58	60	56	100	74
MUL	38	28		43	35						
WHT	50	56	61	61	57	52	58	76	80	86	56
FRL	32	44	42	41	44	40	43	59	56	90	63
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	13	40	42	16	36	33	35	37		87	38
ELL	11	37	33	11	31	36					
BLK	16	26	25	19	30	28	17	29		73	38
HSP	30	46	41	34	40	39	52	65		78	67
MUL	44	50		38	50						
WHT	48	55	57	53	52	48	65	77	45	86	52
FRL	33	43	39	38	43	38	49	65	32	73	38
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	7	29	30	18	31	27	16	26		85	14
ELL	14	14		25	47						
BLK	14	33	32	23	36	31	16	30		81	35
HSP	28	36	42	40	47	45	34	70		83	42
MUL	33	35		47	50			50			
WHT	45	41	35	57	51	28	55	78	31	82	42
FRL	29	37	34	42	47	36	35	62	23	78	38

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	59
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	86
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	708
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

The lowest performance schoolwide has been ELA achievement. This has also been the lowest data point over the last two years of available FSA Data. In 2018 the school overall was at 39% achievement and in 2019 the school was at 42% proficiency. The middle school continues to struggle the most in reading proficiency being well below the state and distinct averages.

iReady Data from 19-20 had 28% of 6th grade students being proficient at mid-year. 21% of 7th grade students were proficient and 16% of 8th graders were proficient.

Star Data from 19-20 showed the following results. 33% of our 8th grade students were proficient at

mid-year. 7% of our 9th graders in English 1 were proficient at mid-year. 68% of our 9th graders in English 2 were proficient and 19% of our English 2 students were proficient at mid-year.

Contributing factors: ELA has improved from one year to the next but it is still a slow improvement. The two week unit and curriculum maps have helped with improvement.

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

The greatest decline in data from 2019 for the school year was in Science Achievement. The contributing factor is unknown, as we actually improved in the area of Biology. The reason for a decrease in Science FCAT proficiency is still unknown, other than it being a different performing group of students, who also in 8th ELA showed concerns with proficiency. Science FCAT is also dependent on having a good set of reading skills and development. The school district also restructured the science curriculum for 6-8th grade which may have attributed to a drop off.

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.

Again, Science Achievement had the biggest gap between our school and the state average for 2019. 8th grade science was 10 percentage points below the state average and Biology was 5 percentage points below the state average. The reason for a decrease in Science FCAT proficiency is still unknown, other than it being a different performing group of students, who also in 8th ELA showed concerns with proficiency. Science FCAT is also dependent on having a good set of reading skills and development. The school district also restructured the science curriculum for 6-8th grade which may have attributed to a drop off.

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

Our last reported math achievement from 2019 would be our largest area of growth, specifically Algebra 1 performance, as it went from 44% to 64% proficient. New structures were put in place school-wide, but our largest contributing factor would be instruction/instructors. We had a new hire who taught many of our Alg 1 students. The use of Algebra Nation we also believe contributed to helping our students to being prepared for the state EOC. Also, our Middle School Acceleration went from 37% to 72%. We would contribute this large increase in placing all of our level 3s and above in 7th grade Math FSA in Algebra 1.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance continues to be an area of concern as reported in 2019, but we have many structures in place to help us to continue to improve in this area. We had 26% of our student population that was missing more than 10% of instruction at the beginning of last year, and this year we were able to move that percentage to 18%.

Students with multiple warning systems also continues to be an extremely high number

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

1. Reading Achievement/Growth for all subgroups
2. Math Achievement/Growth for all subgroups
3. Attendance Rate of Students
4. Science Achievement- specifically 8th grade- all subgroups
5. SWD subgroup in all areas; Multiracial subgroup in all areas

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading proficiency. Our reading proficiency remains below 50%, and it is below the state average as well.
Measurable Outcome:	Williston Middle High School would like to increase our reading proficiency from 42% proficiency to 50% measured by FSA ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joshua Slemp (joshua.slemp@levyk12.org)
	Monthly data chats/PSTs with ELA Teachers about level 1s and 2s , SWDs(ESSA Federal Index below 41%), and multiracial students(ESSA Federal Index below 41%)they are serving. We will review progress monitoring data (weekly/biweekly ELA assessments, iReady, Achieve 3000 data points, Read 180 data points, iReady lesson work/Diagnostics, Retake results).
	Engagement PD-WICOR Strategies and Focused notetaking; Look fors in CWTs and Formals
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher planning days with Coaches; Peer observations.
	WOW nights- Working on the Work nights, where teachers collaboratively plan with peers for the units ahead. At these nights administration, coaches, and teachers will review data, evaluate where they are in alignment with district maps, examine the standards for upcoming units, and plan for assessments.
	Devil Den Chats- Students monitor attendance, behavior, and especially academics. This form is sent home and signed by parents monthly.
	Reading Parent Night- Show parents how they can help at home; Strategies for helping SWD
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rationale for strategies- These strategies increased our performance this past year, so we are keeping with the same way of work, with an increase in fidelity. Parent surveys indicate the need for help at home and continuous feedback on student performance, thus the parent night and Devil Den Chats.School Grade Target, CNA, Classroom walkthoughs and formal observations to check for effective implementation of the standards and the district curriculum maps, Lesson plans will also be checked by administration weekly/biweekly; Progress monitoring data

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule PSTs for progress monitoring and discussions with teachers. Set up data sheets to be used at these meetings/monitor data with a focus on 1s/2s, SWDs(ESSA Federal Index below 41%), and multiracial students(ESSA Federal Index below 41%)
2. Administration checks lesson plans biweekly.
3. Schedule WOW nights for collaboration on standards and assessments. Plan for how to utilize SIP days to add additional planning in this area.
4. Schedule Reading Parent Night.
5. Schedule planning days with Reading teachers and coaches.

6. Get teachers/students Devil Den Chat forms; Schedule these on the calendar

7. Schedule peer observations

8. CWTs and Formals to check for follow up/follow through on WICOR and Focused note taking, along with other high engagement strategies.

Person Responsible Joshua Slemp (joshua.slemp@levyk12.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

As indicate in 2019 data,ELA Achievement- All ELA teachers will be utilizing 2 week standard cycles. These are mapped out where a standards mastery check is at the end of each two week unit. Monthly PST's with administration for progress monitoring and discussions of students of concern. Focus will be on SWD's as well as multiracial students. , Lesson Plans checked for standards alignment, required participating in WOW/SIP days.

Part IV: Positive Culture & 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 are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

WMHS offers several events, meetings and conferences to involve our parents, guardians and stakeholders on our campus. In August, we held our Open House for our incoming 6th graders and new students to tour the campus, followed by our Annual Title 1 Meeting and SAC membership meeting held September 15, 2020. We offer two Parent Conference Nights, many after school extra curricular and sporting events as well as setting the tone for an Open Door Policy for all stakeholders to be informed. WMHS continues to strive to create a positive campus climate for all of our stakeholders and allow them to be an integral part our students ongoing success. In our current climate of social distancing we have enhanced and utilized our social media avenues such as Facebook, Remind, Instagram, Skyward Messaging, Zoom and Google Meets to encourage more participation at our events. As an additional resource for our teachers to support our families for engagement, we scheduled Dr. Constantino for professional development to share best practices to help create a welcoming campus for our parents and stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**