Windy Hill Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Windy Hill Middle School

3575 HANCOCK RD, Clermont, FL 34711

https://whm.lake.k12.fl.us/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our Mission at Windy Hill Middle School is to promote the love of learning through a partnership with the students, parents, teachers, and the community, for success in the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"One pack empowering students for life!"

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
Cousineau, Kelly	Principal	Kelly Cousineau, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-driven decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing effective teaching strategies; conducts assessments of skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support implementation; provides sufficient quantities of technology for academic support, ensures AVID National Demonstration School best practices and showcases; and communicates with SAC and stakeholders monthly on progress.
Epp, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Grade Level Administrator: Duties include: discipline, x-block progress and reading with conferring, MTSS, facilities use and work orders supervisor, Meet the Teacher, Parent Conference Night, and 6th grade Orientation, Safety Contact, data chats, CTE Contact, AVID Administration, LSA Contact, Safety Contact, Fieldtrips & Calendar, Master Scheduling, Volunteer Coordinator, school event supervision, social media-Facebook, among other responsibilities.
Walker-Lawrence, Kim	Assistant Principal	Grade Level Administrator: Duties include: discipline, x-block progress and reading with conferring, MTSS, Edgenuity/Tutoring/Saturday Session, Summer School, oversees teaching assistants, Faculty & Team Leader Meetings, FAME & Honor Celebrations, oversees testing, website, student agendas, duty schedule, new teacher induction & support, school plus & detentions, among other responsibilities.
Garcia, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Grade Level Administrator: Duties include: discipline, x-block progress and reading with conferring, MTSS, IXL, Service Learners, Lowest 25%, Science Department, Transportation, Clerical and Guidance Staff, Professional Developments, 8th Grade Celebrations, Technology, Textbooks, Health, Positive Behavior Supports, Employee Recognitions, School Pictures, Athletics, Title IX, Fundraisers, Teacher Appreciation, Sunshine Committee, Student ID's, among other responsibilities.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team compiled various portions of the SIP. The 2022-2023 SIP was frequently reviewed and revisited with all required shareholders during School Advisory Council meetings.This input helped guide the development of the current SIP. This practice will continue with the 2023-2024 SIP.

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 monitored by the school leadership team as well as the SAC. Data will be collected for all goals and monitored quarterly for improvement. If the SIP produces desired outcomes, the school leadership team will revise the plane to ensure continuous improvement.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	70%
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) Native American Students (AMI)* 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	75	105	241
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	28	42	78
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	83	97	264
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	77	61	228
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	63	56	202

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	67	85	83	235

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	1	0	0	1

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	114	119	166	399
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	42	55	109
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	87	99	123	309
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	102	113	336
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	91	114	273
	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	1	3	3	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	15	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

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	114	119	166	399
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	42	55	109
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	87	99	123	309
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	102	113	336
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	91	114	273
	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	1	3	3	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	15	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

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*	53	43	49	54	45	50	55		
ELA Learning Gains				49			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			46		
Math Achievement*	58	52	56	56	33	36	53		
Math Learning Gains				61			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			47		
Science Achievement*	57	42	49	58	50	53	48		
Social Studies Achievement*	65	64	68	72	54	58	70		
Middle School Acceleration	74	70	73	72	45	49	75		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					67	70			
ELP Progress	53	44	40	55	71	76	26		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	554
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	4	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	51			
HSP	58			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	52			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	45			
AMI	37	Yes	1	
ASN	72			
BLK	50			
HSP	54			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

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	53			58			57	65	74			53
SWD	21			27			29	36	39		5	
ELL	32			42			42	40	69		6	53
AMI												
ASN	73			80			69	67	85		5	
BLK	42			47			40	55	70		5	
HSP	49			54			55	60	75		6	53
MUL	67			61			71	54	69		5	
PAC												
WHT	57			64			63	76	72		5	
FRL	43			47			48	55	68		6	50

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	54	49	33	56	61	44	58	72	72			55
SWD	20	35	31	28	50	45	27	50				
ELL	38	49	26	37	54	45	33	50	60			55
AMI	17	30		50	50							
ASN	68	57		68	73		73	93	69			
BLK	43	48	33	42	54	45	41	66	76			
HSP	51	49	38	53	59	42	55	70	68			57
MUL	47	57	33	52	56	50	54	79	69			
PAC												
WHT	63	48	28	64	65	46	67	74	75			
FRL	44	43	26	44	53	38	49	63	72			42

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	55	56	46	53	53	47	48	70	75			26
SWD	28	40	31	24	42	40	24	44	43			
ELL	37	52	50	37	50	56	37	50	62			26
AMI												
ASN	66	65		61	53		67	73	85			
BLK	45	50	38	41	49	41	35	56	75			
HSP	49	55	50	46	50	50	40	63	68			29
MUL	45	61	75	52	56	38	81	69	79			
PAC												
WHT	63	57	42	63	57	43	56	80	78			
FRL	44	51	41	40	46	41	37	60	62			17

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
07	2023 - Spring	47%	43%	4%	47%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	46%	5%	47%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	46%	2%	47%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	52%	55%	-3%	54%	-2%
07	2023 - Spring	31%	47%	-16%	48%	-17%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	56%	8%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	55%	44%	11%	44%	11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	51%	37%	50%	38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	67%	-5%	66%	-4%

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.

Proficiency rates were lowest in ELA achievement as evidenced by the 2023 FAST Assessment. ELA proficiency decreased by approximately 5 percentage points (54% in 2022 to approx. 49% in 2023). This has been a continuous drop in the last three school years (55% in 2021). The only grade level that showed growth in ELA was 8th grade (51% in 2022 to 52% in 2023). This could be attributed to the increased use of physical text in hand throughout the school year compared to the other grade levels. Two subgroups with less than 41% proficiency are student with disabilities (36%) and American Indians (37%).

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

Proficiency rates were lowest in ELA achievement as evidenced by the 2023 FAST Assessment. ELA proficiency decreased by approximately 5 percentage points (54% in 2022 to approx. 49% in 2023). This has been a continuous drop in the last three school years (55% in 2021). The only grade level that showed growth in ELA was 8th grade (51% in 2022 to 52% in 2023). This could be attributed to the increased use of physical text in hand throughout the school year compared to the other grade levels. The start of the decrease in ELA proficiency data aligns with the adoption of the Amplify curriculum which may also be a contributing factor.

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.

7th Grade Math had the largest gap compared to the state average. Our 7th grade math scored at 37% proficient while the state average was 46% proficient. This is an expected consequence of testing the advanced 7th grade classes on the pre-algebra FAST. Essentially, all students testing proficient in 6th grade in 2022 did not take the 7th grade FAST. This resulted in lower proficiency scores in 7th grade.

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

The area that showed the greatest improvement was in Math Achievement. The math scores increased by almost 3 percentage points (56% in 2022 and approx. 59% in 2023). During the 2022-2023 school year, we adopted a new math curriculum and adjusted our accelerated classes. Students identified as high performing in fifth grade were placed into a Geometry cohort. Those students took the pre-algebra test in sixth grade. That same group of students will take Algebra I in 7th grade and Geometry in their 8th grade year. Students also had access to online computer programs such as ALEKS and IXL. The principal and an assistant principal also implemented and facilitated targeted intervention groups for students on the bubble of proficiency during X-block.

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

The 235 students with two or more EWS indicators are the most significant concern. Looking at the indicators, by targeting the Level 1's in ELA (264) and the students absent 10% or more days (241), we can decrease this number.

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

1. ELA proficiency & Level 1s
2. Increase Proficiency of SWD
3. Reducing Excessive Absences
4. Increase the Number of Students in and passing assessments in CTE and Algebra 1

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

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.

Increase the cognitive demand in student tasks and assessments through systems interdependent instructional programs, resulting in standards-based instruction, and
increased access to CTE programs and passage of CTE certification assessments
& Algebra EOC.

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

Increase learning gains in the core subject areas by 3% through reading, writing, thinking, and talking in every class daily. Increase targeted growth and feedback
through teacher feedback cycles and student assessments based on standards based instruction and data analysis. Increase overall proficiency for all students in
core subject areas by 8%; increase industry acceleration by at least 9%, from 55% to 64%, by providing more students access to CTE industry and Algebra courses.

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

Monitoring of the goal will be evaluated in various ways. Overall, lesson plan submission, classroom learning walks, weekly trend analysis, targeted feedback,
'push-in support services evaluated quarterly', data chats with teachers, performance matters data, and conferring with students about their learning.

With professional development for teachers to increase cognitive demand and adequate support for all areas/ students to have increased opportunities to access
CTE programs and high-school level courses, students will have the ability to grow academically and have more advanced opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students have access to increased CTE program: computer applications, culinary, coding, intro to technology, and business keyboarding. Additionally, student can
take industry certifications courses in digital information tools, culinary and algebra, increasing access to high school courses at the middle-school level.

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

Based on the school gains and areas of need from last year, we believe continuing and increasing the instructional focuses of reading, writing, thinking, talking and
remediation will be effective strategies to continue making learning gains. The data used in making this determination was based on FSA, EOC outcomes, and
remedial progress. Moving forward, we will look at Progress Monitoring (PM) and Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), to guide our data based decisions.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Increase the number of minutes students are reading and annotating text in hand to improve understanding of complex grade-level text. This is an identified area of need because we saw a drop in overall proficiency from 52% to 49% (3%) from the 2021-2023 school year to the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Fifty-two percent of the students will show proficiency in ELA on PM-3.

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

During weekly collaboration, teachers will discuss and compare data on how well students mastered standards on common assessments. During X-Block, teachers will re-teach standards not mastered. The administration will conduct quarterly data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use X-Block to pull in students not mastering standards. During the intervention block, the teacher has the opportunity to work with individuals, small groups, and the whole group to reteach the standards. Teachers will utilize IXL, BrainPop, and reading magazines during this time to decrease the number of students earning a level 1 and/or 2 on state assessments. Tutoring times will be offered before and after school, during Saturday slam sessions, and during the summer as well.

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

The following data shows proficiency in each grade level on PM 3. Although the data increased throughout the year, we need at least 52% of the students showing proficiency in each grade level.

6th grade - 48%
7th grade - 47%
8th grade - 52%

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.

Instructional review with a focus on ELA.

Person Responsible: Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of September 2023

Meet with the ELA team to develop a plan of focus for instructional decisions during collaborative time.

Person Responsible: Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Meet quarterly.

Complete monthly data dives connecting work in the curriculum with data.

Person Responsible: Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As a result of student progress monitoring, absences were identified as a factor in quarterly failures and low performance on benchmark tests. In reducing excessive absences through remediation, mentor-ship, positive behavior, and classroom engagement, student will have increased opportunities to and enhanced exposure to standards based instruction. Consistent monitoring and providing support systems for students with an increased opportunity for exposure to standards based instruction with enhancements in reading, writing, thinking, and talking. Remediation opportunities through X-Block/Flextime are targeted through data chats and data dissection among the team, as well as through Resources, a sector of ESE, and grade recovery via E2020. With the enhancement of technology support of Chromebooks, students have an even greater opportunity for academic success having on and off campus access to their academics.

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

In addition to our continuous effort throughout the school year with initiatives like Attendance Week, attendance celebrations, and parent communications, students attending school on a regular basis will receive high-quality standards-based instruction with the inclusion of reading, writing, thinking and talking, which will showcase growth in the major core content areas (ELA, Math, Science, SS) by the end of the year. Additionally, the Windy Hill Middle School Leadership team will monitor growth of school-wide attendance and the effect on standardized testing with the goal of improving our overall level 3 and above passing on end of year assessments.

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

Absences will be monitored on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Garcia (garciac1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Windy Hill Middle School will partner with families early on as student absenteeism becomes chronic. Certified school counselors will make contact with families of students as well as the school social worker. WHMS leadership will guide the actions/needs by making recommendations of support as noted by data.

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

Conversations with other middle schools who had success with students in the lowest quartile.

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.

Develop an individualized action plan with services and support

Person Responsible: Christopher Garcia (garciac1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When:

Review data of attendance highlighting students and creating support strategies.

Person Responsible: Christopher Garcia (garciac1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When:

Recognize students with excellent attendance quarterly, monthly, and annually (FAME).

Person Responsible: Christopher Garcia (garciac1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When:

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

Overall, thirty-six percent of students with disabilities showed proficiency.

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

Forty-one percent of students with disabilities will show proficiency.

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

Each quarter, a focus standard will be selected. Teachers will provide several opportunities for students to master the focus standard. The teacher will develop and administer common collaborative formative assessments based on the focus standard. Students will receive small group instruction when the focus standard is not mastered as identified in the formative assessments. Students will receive additional practice using IXL and ALEKS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Kim Walker-Lawrence (walkerk2@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students requiring additional instruction to master the focus standard for each quarter will receive whole group, small group, and one-to-one assistance during X-block, provided daily.

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

Students will receive additional support during the school day because transportation is an issue for students to attend before and after-school tutoring.

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.

The teachers will identify, teach, and assess the focus standard(s).

Person Responsible: Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Teachers will identify students to attend x-block intervention sessions.

Person Responsible: Matthew Epp (eppm@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily

The teachers will reassess the focus standard(s) for mastery.

Person Responsible: Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

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).

All resources regarding the SIP are worked on collaboratively between the SAC and the school administrative team. The funding of IXL to support ELA growth is partially funded through SAI and the SAC budget. Resources like ALEKS and Flextime Manager come from the district level. The school social worker and guidance counselors can contribute to reducing problematic attendance.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes