Walker Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Walker Elementary School

2988 STILLWELL BLVD, Crestview, FL 32539

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okaloosa County School Board on 8/28/2023.

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.

Placing students on a pathway to success by providing high quality instruction, a wide array of marketable experiences, and unparalleled extracurricular opportunities while developing relationships that meet both their academic and emotional needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing today's students for success within and beyond the classroom.

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
Lopez, Mandy	Principal	Schedule leadership meetings and bring student data to analyze and discuss; monitor implementation of SIP and decide whether changes are needed.
Drake, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team member; will assist with looking over data to determine if what we are doing is working effectively
Springle, Nita	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team member; will assist with looking over data to determine if what we are doing is working effectively
Kinney, Maureen	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team member; will assist with looking over data to determine if what we are doing is working effectively
McMillan, Lauren	Other	Title I teacher and team member; will assist with looking over data to determine if what we are doing is working effectively
Medlock, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team member; will assist with looking over data to determine if what we are doing is working effectively
Turner, Steven	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team member; will assist with looking over data to determine if what we are doing is working effectively

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.

This process began in late April with our leadership team. Teachers, instructional coaches, and administrators met to evaluate last year's SPP and progress towards our goals. We discussed needs based on available data as well as goals for the upcoming school year. ELA, math, and science teams broke off to brainstorm ideas for implementation. In May, we met back together to make necessary changes based on data and teacher input. The leadership team discussed findings from informal conversations they'd had with their teams about student performance concerns and instructional needs. The team began revising the SPP. During post-planning, a draft of the SPP was distributed to all teachers looking for feedback. This was done again at pre-planning, and a meeting was held in August giving teachers an opportunity to voice suggestions and offer changes. Teachers were given until the end of August to suggest changes or additions. When our team's work was presented to SAC, comprised of faculty, administrators, parents, and community members, all stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback. All concerns and suggestions were considered.

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))

All classroom teachers keep student data charts. They will know which students fit in this ESE subgroup and will pay particular attention to these students. Our VE and ESE teachers all keep student data charts. These teachers will meet with admin each quarter to discuss growth. Additionally, admin will monitor progress on district assessments as well as checking grades.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	61%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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	27	36	27	32	20	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	0	5	6	5	9	6	0	0	0	31
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	31	13	21	19	1	0	0	0	85
Course failure in Math	0	22	10	16	5	3	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	8	32	27	19	19	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	17	14	19	15	22	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	32	27	19	19	0	0	0	105

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	33	37	38	28	25	0	0	0	161

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	1	2	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

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	33	28	26	14	30	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	6	3	1	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	7	12	22	5	8	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	0	4	9	17	8	6	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	13	32	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	16	32	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	32	13	32	0	0	0	77

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	5	9	38	18	37	0	0	0	107

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	24	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	33	28	26	14	30	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	6	3	1	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	7	12	22	5	8	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	0	4	9	17	8	6	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	13	32	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	16	32	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	32	13	32	0	0	0	77

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	5	9	38	18	37	0	0	0	107

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	24	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

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*	58	59	53	54	61	56	57		
ELA Learning Gains				56			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			34		
Math Achievement*	59	65	59	57	47	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				60			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			33		
Science Achievement*	53	57	54	54	63	59	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					61	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	80	60	59						

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	313
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	42			
ELL	80			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	51			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	60			

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%
FRL	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	51			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	49			

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	58			59			53					80
SWD	42			43			40				4	
ELL											1	80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			44			38				4	
HSP	52			62			40				3	
MUL	72			61			55				4	

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
PAC												
WHT	59			62			61				4	
FRL	52			50			49				4	

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	56	52	57	60	50	54					
SWD	33	42	45	46	34	22	28					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	50	50	37	56	57	32					
HSP	52	64		43	43							
MUL	63	59		69	71							
PAC												
WHT	59	57	55	62	62	49	59					
FRL	45	51	55	46	56	52	40					

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	57	48	34	53	37	33	38					
SWD	35	48	40	44	35	21	24					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	22		37	28		11					
HSP	38			46								
MUL	69	40		54	40		27					
PAC												
WHT	61	55	50	58	38	35	48					
FRL	47	45	32	46	40	35	34					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide
assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or
all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	54%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	67%	-8%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	55%	5%	50%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	71%	65%	6%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	72%	-21%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	63%	-9%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	57%	-7%	51%	-1%

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.**

Our Students with Disabilities performed the lowest at 36% based on 21-22 data. This subgroup
performed at 35% the year prior (20-21) and 34% based on 18-19 data. (2019-2020 is not notated due to
Covid.) While the growth is small, this subgroup is trending upward. While these students are growing,
they still struggle to meet proficiency.

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

Our SWD declined in the following areas from the 2020-2021 school year to the 2021-2022 school year --

ELA achievement (35 to 33), ELA LG (48 to 42) and Math LG (35 to 34).

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.

Our 4th grade ELA and Math data (current 5th grade students) came in lower than we would like. This group has been struggling historically as well, scoring 30% proficient at the end of their 3rd grade year. We are putting supports in place to support these students and close the gaps.

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

Our SWD showed improvement in the following areas from the 2020-2021 school year to the 2021-2022 school year -- ELA LG L25% (40 to 45), Math achievement (44 to 46), Math LG L25% (21 to 22), and Science achievement (24 to 28). Some of our ESE students received not only ESE services but push-in assistant support as well.

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

Students with 10% or higher absences.

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. Students with 10% or higher absences
3. Black students (to ensure we do not drop below 41% again)

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

At Walker Elementary, we build upon relationships to create a safe family environment that encourages growth and belonging by teaching the whole child. The Walker family supports students academically, socially, and emotionally.

"Walker - Not Just a School but a Family"

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

We will have a 50% increase in teacher Owl bucks turned in for the 23-24 school year.

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

Only 25 teacher Owl bucks were turned in for the last school year. These rewards help encourage a positive working environment and culture, and should be turned in more frequently. We will keep a count of how many are turned in.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Lopez (mandy.lopez@okaloosaschools.com)

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.)

PBIS

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

PBIS is a state supported initiative for students, so we have added a teacher and staff element into it. We will monitor it this school year.

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. 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.

Our SWD scored at 36% proficient, which is below the 41% state goal.

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

Walker's goal is to increase the proficiency of these students to at least 41%.

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

We will monitor our SWD throughout the year using student data charts that show grades as well as district and state diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Lopez (mandy.lopez@okaloosaschools.com)

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.)

Not only will our SWD be receiving their IEP-dictated supports in their VE/ESE classrooms, but we will "double-dip" with these students, meaning they will receive an additional round of support from a school paraprofessional using a Benchmark Intervention Phonics Kit.

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

Many of our SWD have gaps in their reading abilities. This intervention program will identify and close gaps, thus leading to reading proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Schools are provided a training and timeline from the Curriculum and Instruction Department to complete the School Improvement Plan (SIP). District offers collaborative opportunities for schools to meet:
• Facilitate sharing and presentation of district-level data.
• Support the inclusion of a variety of data sources; assist data collection efforts with district resources and connections.
• Bring schools together to focus on related priorities in order to pool expertise and resources.
Schools then conduct a needs assessment to stakeholders and prioritize needs to be included in SIP. District reviews school SIP and during review process ensures school identifies allowable funding sources that are not currently being utilized to implement the strategy(s) intended to improve learner outcomes; instructional coaches, tutoring, ESE resources, and professional learning. If funding does not match school's identified focus areas, the District will engage school in further conversation with inquiries such as;
• Connect schools with available statewide systems of support, including external facilitators and high quality professional development (FDLRS and FIN).
• Identify the necessary resources that are not currently available to ensure the strategy is implemented as intended.
• Determine what training is necessary for teachers to ensure the strategy is implemented as intended.
After District provides feedback to schools, the SIP will be refined and submitted. School district leadership will meet quarterly with schools for collaborative discussion, feedback, and progress monitoring updates on status of SIP focus areas.
• As a reminder, below is the ESSA SIP Timeline
o August 8-11: SIPs will be reviewed by Curriculum and feedback provided to schools
o August 15: Completed SIPs due on CIMS
o August 16: SIPs placed on Board Docs
o August 28: SIPs on Board Agenda for approval
o August 30: Board approved SIPs due to DOE (Curriculum will submit)

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.

SAC meetings, school webpage (https://www2.okaloosaschools.com/o/walker), school Facebook page, PTO

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))

School webpage: https://www2.okaloosaschools.com/o/walker

We pride ourselves on being more than just a school, but a family. As such, we build relationships as

soon as families come to register or transfer to us. We welcome everyone in with a smile and support during all of our encounters. We reach out to families through newsletters, webpages, and call outs, and classroom teachers communicate with messaging apps and newsletters as well. Progress can be viewed on our district's FOCUS app, and directions to do so are shared with parents. We have nights specifically designated for family engagement and advertise these nights through flyers and our social media pages.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Our school-based MTSS process serves to strengthen the academic programs in our school.

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))

We had our first kindergarten kickstart program this summer, where we invited almost-kindergarten students to come in and get a feel for how kindergarten works at Walker.

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))

We have a CDAC counselor that can meet with students with parent permission; we also have a mental health counselor that meets with students according to their IEP needs, but has the ability to see all students, even those in crisis.

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))

We offer STEM opportunities for students after school in our CTE/Stem programs.

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).

We address problem behavior in our MTSS meetings. We meet as a team with the classroom teacher and potentially parent to create a plan to decrease behaviors and as a result, increase learning.

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))

PL is offered by the district in August and January, while school-based PL is on a needs-basis. Teachers and admin are both able to identify needs and put PL opportunities in place. Currently, our first district PL will be in August, then again for school-based in August for writing.

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))

Kinder Kickstart happens in July to support preschool children to elementary school.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	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