Orange County Public Schools

Wolf Lake Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Wolf Lake Middle

1725 W PONKAN RD, Apopka, FL 32712

https://wolflakems.ocps.net/

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Haupt, Cynthia	Principal	Provide a common vision for instruction and the use of data based decision making; supervision, evaluation and coaching of all instructional personnel; manage and maintain all school facilities; ensure the safety and security of all staff and students; ensure that the school based team is implementing multi tier system of support (MTSS); ensure implementation of intervention support and enrichment activities as well as collecting documentation; ensure adequate professional development to support core instruction and implementation of new programs or curriculum, including the use of digital devices; collaborate with the Professional Learning Communities to gain input and suggestions from the teachers as well as review lesson planning; and communicate with parents regarding school based plans and activities.
Goletz, Ashlee	Assistant Principal	Support the common vision for instruction and the use of data based decision making; supervision, evaluation ad coaching of all instructional personnel; manage and maintain all school facilities; ensure the safety and security of all staff and students; ensure implementation of intervention support and enrichment activities as well as collecting documentation; ensure adequate professional development to support core instruction and implementation of new programs or curriculum, including the use of digital devices; collaborate with the professional learning communities to gain input and suggestions from the teachers as well as review lesson planning; building the master schedule and coordinating with guidance counselors on program requirements; and communicates with parents regarding school based plans and activities.
Palmer, Marcus	Dean	Develop, support and monitor our school wide discipline plan; develop a school wide student motivational program; monitor and analyze the discipline data on a regular basis; coordinate the Behavior Leadership Team; observe in classrooms in order to offer suggestions to teachers on classroom management plans; communicate with parents and students on a regular basis; coordinate the Behavior Leadership Team; observe in classrooms in order to offer suggestions to teachers on classroom management plans; communicate with parents and students on a regular basis in regards to behavior and behavioral concerns; serve on the administrative leadership team; serve on the CHAMPS committee; uphold our district's Student Code of Conduct; conduct Restorative Justice circles; and work closely with our teacher in the positive alternative to school suspension (PASS) program.
Franklin, Julius	Dean	Develop, support and monitor our school wide discipline plan; develop a school wide student motivational program; monitor and analyze the discipline data on a regular basis; coordinate the Behavior Leadership Team; observe in classrooms in order to offer suggestions to teachers on classroom management plans; communicate with parents and students on a regular basis; coordinate the Behavior Leadership Team; observe in classrooms in order to offer suggestions to teachers on classroom management plans; communicate with parents and students on a regular

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		basis in regards to behavior and behavioral concerns; serve on the administrative leadership team; serve on the CHAMPS committee; uphold our district's Student Code of Conduct; conduct Restorative Justice circles; and work closely with our teacher in the positive alternative to school suspension (PASS) program.
Plotkin, Lisa	Dean	Develop, support and monitor our school wide discipline plan; develop a school wide student motivational program; monitor and analyze the discipline data on a regular basis; coordinate the Behavior Leadership Team; observe in classrooms in order to offer suggestions to teachers on classroom management plans; communicate with parents and students on a regular basis; coordinate the Behavior Leadership Team; observe in classrooms in order to offer suggestions to teachers on classroom management plans; communicate with parents and students on a regular basis in regards to behavior and behavioral concerns; serve on the administrative leadership team; serve on the CHAMPS committee; uphold our district's Student Code of Conduct; conduct Restorative Justice circles; and work closely with our teacher in the positive alternative to school suspension (PASS) program.
Washington, Luther	Other	Implement comprehensive mentoring programs. Coordinate and serve on the Threat Assessment Team and ensure that district reporting is accurate and timely. Assist parents regularly with counseling and finding community resources as needed. Conduct Restorative Justice circles as necessary.
Schmidt, Danielle	Other	Administer school wide testing with fidelity and ensuring that all accommodated students receive appropriate accommodations. Collector of all data to include: state and district testing, culminating summative testing, sub group information, effectiveness of tutoring on data, etc. Provide professional development regarding where data is, how to disaggregate it and how to incorporate it into instruction when it is disaggregated.
Foisy, Tracy	Instructional Coach	Attend all professional learning community meetings with a focus on scope and sequence, specific standards based instruction to include providing professional development regarding where to find specific date related to math, how to disaggregate it and how to incorporate it into instruction when it is disaggregated. Once the data is disaggregated focusing on how students will be retaught and reassessed who were not proficient in the previous data point. Assisting teachers in the deliberate practice process.
Orizondo, Traci	Instructional Coach	Attend all professional learning community meetings with a focus on scope and sequence, specific standards based instruction to include providing professional development regarding where to find specific date related to reading and ELA; how to disaggregate it and how to incorporate it into instruction when it is disaggregated. Once the data is disaggregated focusing on how students will be retaught and reassessed who were not

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		proficient in the previous data point. Assisting teachers in the deliberate practice process.

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 Advisory Council's input is requested 3 times during the school year to assess strengths of the school and areas that we can improve upon. The School Advisory Council consists of parents, students, staff members and community members.

The school uses the leadership team the school literacy council and the professional learning community leaders to gather input on the School Improvement Plan.

Students are also surveyed to provide input on how the school functions and climate.

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 School Improvement Plan will be monitored monthly with the School Advisory Committee and the Parent, Teacher, Student Organization. The plan will be updated and revised as necessary based on the most current data to ensure continuous improvement. The SIP will also be reviewed monthly during the instructional coach's meeting to revisit, review and revise the plan as necessary. Discussion during these meetings will include:
classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring, common planning minutes/input, staff feedback, parental and community input when available.

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	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	83%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No

ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: 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	49	76	59	184
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	73	60	146
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	123	107	303
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	86	35	200
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	65	108	67	240

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	1	5	1	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	6

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	76	58	88	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	45	47	102
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	1	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	103	133	311
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	100	82	261
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	103	133	311

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	72	91	100	263

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	76	58	88	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	45	47	102
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	1	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	103	133	311
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	100	82	261
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	103	133	311

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	72	91	100	263

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	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*	52	48	49	50	49	50	53		
ELA Learning Gains				45			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			33		
Math Achievement*	70	57	56	61	36	36	58		
Math Learning Gains				65			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			38		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	50	53	49	58	55	53	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	64	68	68	61	58	65		
Middle School Acceleration	73	77	73	76	52	49	79		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	54	43	40	50	79	76	36		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	563
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	21	Yes	4	4
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	52			
HSP	58			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	73			
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	30	Yes	3	3
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	52			
HSP	52			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	47			

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	52			70			50	64	73			54
SWD	14			28			11	31			4	
ELL	35			58			33	55	59		6	54
AMI												
ASN	80			95							2	
BLK	43			62			38	51	65		5	
HSP	47			66			51	61	68		6	55
MUL	54			76			53	64	77		5	
PAC												
WHT	65			81			63	77	79		5	
FRL	40			61			38	53	65		5	

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	50	45	34	61	65	56	58	68	76			50
SWD	11	26	23	19	41	39	20	27	60			
ELL	24	32	29	42	58	48	22	47	40			50
AMI												
ASN	85	81		79	73							
BLK	41	42	37	49	63	58	46	61	75			
HSP	41	39	30	55	61	54	52	63	75			
MUL	48	41		62	57		50	65	64			
PAC												
WHT	64	52	42	77	70	57	72	78	80			
FRL	33	37	32	44	60	50	42	56	71			

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	53	49	33	58	46	38	50	65	79			36
SWD	12	28	23	19	31	31	8	26				
ELL	23	32	27	31	33	27	7	30				36

						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
AMI												
ASN	85	63		90	84							
BLK	46	45	31	46	38	35	44	59	73			
HSP	42	44	32	50	44	33	40	54	69			26
MUL	55	49		59	41			75	75			
PAC												
WHT	66	56	36	74	53	56	65	76	86			
FRL	35	39	29	41	42	35	29	45	58			

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	48%	45%	3%	47%	1%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	46%	3%	47%	2%
06	2023 - Spring	49%	44%	5%	47%	2%

				MATH		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	60%	53%	7%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	57%	38%	19%	48%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	73%	58%	15%	55%	18%

				SCIENCE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	44%	6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	47%	51%	50%	48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	45%	53%	48%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	66%	-2%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component that clearly showed the lowest performance was English Language Arts (ELA). The overall proficiency fell from 50 percent proficient in 2021-2022 school year on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) to 48 percent proficient in the 2022-2023 school year on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST). One of the main contributing factors include having permanent substitutes in 2 ELA classrooms for the entire year due to being unable to find teachers. The scores in the 6th grade classes with a substitute were 37 percent proficiency and the scores for the 8th grade classroom with a substitute is 31 percent proficiency The downward trend of the proficiency score is in the third year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2021-2022 is our Science. In 2021-2022 the Science proficiency rate was 58 percent; whereas in 2022-2023 the proficiency rate was 50 percent. A factor that may have contributed to this decline was a new teacher to the grade level subject and her students received 28 percent proficiency rate. Other factors that have have contributed to the decline was a lack of fidelity of teachers reteaching and reassessing after unit tests as well as a lack of differentiated instruction.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average would be Civics. The state average of proficiency is 66% proficient and the proficiency for Wolf Lake Middle School is

64%. This is a gap of 2%. One of the factors that contributed to the gap is the fact that there was one teacher new to Civics and another teacher that taught 2 different grade levels which made planning as a team difficult. Data wasn't used as it should have been to drive the instruction nor was it used to determine who specifically needed retaught and reassessed with a focus on our struggling subgroups of students with disabilities and our English language learners.

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

Overall, the data component that showed the most improvement was Mathematics. We received the highest proficiency score in the school's history for the third year in a row. Within the mathematics data component our acceleration data was the most improved.

The mathematics department has been working to improve their data driven instruction. There is specific time set aside in their professional learning communities to disaggregate the most current data point that they have to determine each individual students strengths and areas in need of improvement. When this is determined the specific needs of students, it is also determined when each students will be retaught and reassessed based on the standards they were not proficient in. If, after the reassessment, the students were still not proficient, they would be pulled in small groups by our Instructional Coach for Mathematics. This process is not embedded within the Mathematics department we have shown growth in the last 3 years of implementation.

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

After reflecting on the Early Warning Systems data one of the areas of concern that stands out is the number of students that have 2 or more indicators. This number decreased in the 2022-2023 school year to 240 students as the 2021-2022 school year there were 263 students. Although the number of students decreased this must be an area of focus this coming school year as this is roughly 20 percent of the school's population.

The second area of concern is the number of students scoring Level 1 on ELA testing. We have 301 students that have scored Level 1. This is roughly 24 percent of our student population. This must be an area of focus.

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

The highest priorities for Wolf Lake Middle School for the upcoming school year include:
1. Increasing Literacy proficiency
2. Increasing Mathematics proficiency
3. Social Emotional Learning
4. Increasing literacy proficiency in the ELL and SWD population

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 Early Warning System

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.

An area of focus for this school year will be school climate. According to 2022-2023 Panorama data the percentage of students with a favorable result for School Climate has remained the same at 32 percent. However, this is an area that needs to score much higher. Specific areas of this would include the connection students feel towards adults in the school and the positive energy of the school. This directly correlates to the Early Warning Systems data of 184 students being absent 10% or more of the school year.

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

According to 2022-2023 Panorama data the percentage of students with a favorable result for School Climate has remained the same at 32 percent. With the focus of school climate this school year a measurable outcome would be to raise the positive result for students by a minimum of 18 percentage points to 50 percent. The Early Warning System component of the number of students being absent 10% or more of the school year will decrease to 150.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through quarterly surveys of students. This survey will focus on the connection they feel towards adults at school and how often teachers seem excited to be teaching your classes. These are the three areas within school climate on Panorama that are the lowest. Student attendance is monitored weekly by teachers, guidance counselors and student services personnel.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Haupt (cynthia.haupt@ocps.net)

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

Students that begin showing signs of attendance concerns, 3-5 days absent, will be assigned a mentor on campus. This mentor will meet regularly with the student and be the liaison between parents and home.

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

The mentoring strategy has been shown to

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.

School will continue to implement school wide celebrations for students with all A's and B's on their report card.

Person Responsible: Sheila Jackson (sheila.jackson@ocps.net)

By When: The Renaissance Celebrations will happen quarterly.

The school will continue to celebrate students that exhibit appropriate behavior while at school or school related functions.

Person Responsible: Lisa Plotkin (lisa.plotkin@ocps.net)

By When: Positive Behavior Incentive celebrations will happen quarterly

Students that need additional support throughout the school day will be assigned a mentor. This mentor will be their person on campus to go to when they need anything at all. This adult will continually check in with the student and check on the student's progress in classes.

Person Responsible: Luther Washington (luther.washington@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing as needed

#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.

This area of focus was identified by previous data points found in previous years Florida standards assessment (FSA) and Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) scores. Wolf Lake Middle School has been declining in the percentage of student proficiency for the last 3 years. Schoolwide proficiency scores are as follows:
2021 53%
2022 50%
2023 48%

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

The specific measurable outcome will be the proficiency percentage of the Progress Monitoring 3 for the 2023-2024 school year. The 2022-2023 school year the Reading proficiency was 50 percent. The outcome will be a minimum of 55 percent schoolwide proficiency.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through all standards based unit assessments as well as all Progress Monitoring throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Haupt (cynthia.haupt@ocps.net)

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

Evidence based interventions include small group instruction. Small group instruction is expected from each ELA teacher specifically after a data point to reteach specific standards that students did not score well on.

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

Small group instruction will ensure that focus is on students that did not understand the instruction the first time. This will give teachers the opportunity to reteach and focus on SWD and ELL students for focused instruction.

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 English Language Arts department will focus on small group instruction and a specific focus on data driven instruction to include reteaching and reassessing when students didn't understand the first time

Person Responsible: Traci Orizondo (traci.orizondo@ocps.net)

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year with a focus on professional learning communities.

Professional learning communities will specifically address data, when and how to reteach and when and how to reassess when students don't understand a standard each and every meeting.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Weekly

#3. 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.

Students with Disabilities have scored below 30 percent proficient in the last three years in the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). In 2020-2021 these students scored 12 percent proficient and in 2021-2022 these students scores 11 percent proficient. We believe when teacher implement small group instruction into their daily lessons, students will receive targeted instruction and feedback on their learning which will lead to an increase in proficiency.

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

By implementing the use of differentiated instruction in the classroom, proficiency in ELA will increase from 11 percent to 20 percent.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by administration attending all professional learning community meetings to ensure deliberate placement of students in small groups based on data disaggregation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Haupt (cynthia.haupt@ocps.net)

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

The evidence based intervention is small group, data driven instruction with an intense focus on achievement data to make instructional decisions that adjust teaching strategies and plan for small groups for the purpose of intervention/ re-teaching/ enrichment appropriate to address their students' needs.

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

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).

As a part of the comprehensive needs assessment, resource allocation based on needs must be considered and prioritized during the planning process. Collaborative discussions enable the schools and district to consider available resources as part of the needs assessment process to inform evidence based planning and final decisions concerning allocation of resources.

Considering the needs, plans and then funds enables sustainable systems and strategies to support improved outcomes for each student.

The process should include a review of the use of the school's resources supported by all funding sources (federal, state and local) including both general funds and funds dedicated to school improvement activities.