

Wakulla County Schools

Medart Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	30
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Medart Elementary School

2558 COASTAL HWY, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://mes.wakullaschooldistrict.org/>

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 Medart is to cultivate opportunities for students to become lifelong learners by offering a rigorous, relevant, and safe learning environment. Students will explore their interests and passions and develop the resiliency to succeed in today's society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Medart Elementary School, our vision is to empower all students, families, and communities to support student learning and growth through rigor, resiliency, and relevance.

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
Allen, Amber	Assistant Principal	Gather and present data at the School Advisory Council meetings, monitor goals, and provide teacher support.
Lawhon, Michele	Teacher, K-12	5th grade teacher, teacher coach, and wellness coach.
Martin, Jodie	Teacher, K-12	School Advisory Chair, ESE Coordinator, Teacher Coach, and Literacy Team Member.
Nelson, Karla	Teacher, K-12	Teacher Coach, Kindergarten teacher, and Literacy Team Member
Smith, Shari	Teacher, K-12	Teacher Coach, Literacy Team Member, and 1st grade teacher.
Tillman, Susan	Reading Coach	Instructional Coach
Mardis, Bailee	Teacher, K-12	Mentor, Teacher Coach, and Literacy Team Member.
Ward, Stan	Principal	Oversees all employees, School Safety, Discipline, Data, and Observations.
Swain, Angela	Teacher, ESE	Teacher Coach and Literacy Team Member.

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.

All teachers, school staff, Literacy team, parents and community leaders are invited to be a part of the SIP development. They are welcome to be a member of the team or just attend School Advisory Council meetings. Invitations to be a part of the process were announced at our Annual Open House and will be announced at Title I nights. Meeting dates are posted on the board in front of the and on the school's web site.

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 continually be monitored by reviewing the most current progress monitoring data. The data is monitored by administration and the district Instructional Coach. The administration will meet with grade levels to review data each nine weeks. The data will also be reviewed at Response to Intervention meetings. The School Advisory Council will also review the data at each meeting. If adequate progress is not being made then we will review and revise the plan to ensure that the needs of the students are being met.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	16%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	87%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	29	41	26	24	25	15	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	5	5	3	0	0	0	21
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	12	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	14	0	0	0	23
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	1	4	7	6	11	11	0	0	0	40

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	11	5	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	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	33	26	22	35	32	20	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	8	9	7	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	5	5	5	8	4	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	10	4	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	22	15	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	16	22	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	4	4	27	21	15	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	7	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	33	26	22	35	32	20	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	8	9	7	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	5	5	5	8	4	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	10	4	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	22	15	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	16	22	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	4	4	27	21	15	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	7	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	57	53	54	63	56	62		
ELA Learning Gains				42			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			7		
Math Achievement*	46	61	59	48	47	50	58		
Math Learning Gains				42			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32			20		
Science Achievement*	59	60	54	54	68	59	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					68	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					68	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress			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](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	200
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	24	Yes	4	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL	38	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	52			

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	40	Yes	1	

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	22	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	20	Yes	3	2
HSP				
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	41			

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			46			59					
SWD	17			29			30				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL	42			33							2	

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	55			48			63				4	
FRL	44			32			52				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	42	36	48	42	32	54					
SWD	21	24	27	18	25	15	25					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			10								
HSP												
MUL	38			54								
PAC												
WHT	57	41	35	50	42	32	56					
FRL	49	44	37	41	36	37	46					

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	62	48	7	58	25	20	49					
SWD	21	14		28	36		23					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL	50			27								
PAC												
WHT	67	54		64	30	30	57					
FRL	48	35	8	51	32	25	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	60%	59%	1%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	55%	-21%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	61%	-18%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	59%	-6%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	64%	-12%	55%	-3%

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 lowest performing area was 35% of third grade students scored proficient on the FAST PM3 ELA assessment. This created an overall grades 3-5 score of 52% proficient in ELA.

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

FAST ELA in grades 3-5 declined from 53% proficient to 52%. The 3rd grade scores were significantly lower than 4th and 5th bringing the overall average down. The 3rd grade was also the area where we had the largest gap when compared to the state average.

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.

Third Grade students scored 35% proficient with an average scale score of 295 (Level 2). The state's average scale score was 300 (Level 3). The students in this cohort were in Kindergarten the year that the school had to shut down for COVID. They missed the last nine weeks of important fundamental skills. The following year, when they returned and should have been catching up on those skills, whole

classes were being quarantined and the absenteeism was high. Another component that is believed to be a cause is teacher turnover. The third grade teachers were all new to the curriculum last year. Third grade was also significantly lower in Math.

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

Fourth and fifth grade ELA, scored above our goal. Fourth grade scored 60% proficient and fifth grade scored 61% proficient. Our goal was 56%. It is believed that these areas were higher due to more time in the classroom with the students, knowledge of the curriculum by the teacher, a collaborative program across the district, High Impact teaching strategies and help within the classroom by the ESE teacher and volunteers. We also feel like the reduction in discipline referrals, through the use of Restorative Discipline, also helped to increase scores.

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

One concern is that 40% of students had absences below 90%. Another concern, is that 14 students in fifth grade made a Level 1 on FAST.

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

Our highest priorities begin with improving 3rd grade ELA and Math. Also, we would like to see our proficiency level for our SWD and Black subgroups reach 41%.

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 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.

52% of 3rd through 5th grade students scored a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3 in 2022-2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Using FAST data for ELA, 56% of students in grades 3-5 will score Level 3 or higher on PM3 in 2023-2024.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Progress Monitoring Data
District-Based Assessments (i-Ready Standards Mastery)
IEP Goals
Response to Intervention/MTSS Process

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.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.)

Professional Learning Communities
Instructional Coaches
Kagan Structures
Response to Intervention/ MTSS process
i-Ready Reading
FCRR Activities
Teacher Coaches
McGraw-Hill Florida Wonders
Quick Reads
Heggerty Bridge the Gap
SIPPS
Remediation Groups

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Administrators and teachers, along with district personal will meet monthly to discuss formative assessment data. These purpose of these data reviews are to guide instructional decisions including the differentiation of reading instruction within the classroom. The meetings will also create a watchlist of students that need additional support. The MTSS team will meet to discuss and review the data through Response to Intervention and IEP goals to insure that adequate progress is being made. SIPPS, Heggerty Bridge the Gap, Quick Reads and FCRR activities are district materials that will be used for intervention. The Literacy Leadership team also plans differentiated instruction and analyzes student progress. The Instructional Coach will meet with grade levels to plan instruction, model instruction, and monitor curriculum. Teachers will use district provided materials, (i.g. - McGraw Hill Florida Wonders, i-Ready Reading) to plan standards-based instruction. Best Practices for Inclusion will be considered when creating IEP's, student placement, and lesson planning. Kagan Structures will be implemented to engage learners. Through PLCs, teachers will plan standard-based lessons that are systematic and will use

explicit instruction that provides scaffolding and differentiation to align with the B.E.S.T. ELA benchmarks. A Remediation teacher will work with small groups to help with our underperforming subgroups. Also, additional paraprofessionals will be designated to work with the ESE teacher to help with the underperforming ESE subgroup.

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 Instructional Coach will monitor student data and the RTI process to ensure interventions are implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.ptillman@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Teacher Coaches will support teachers through professional development, modeling, analyzing student data, resources, observations, PLCs, feedback and lesson planning support.

Person Responsible: Karla Nelson (karla.nelson@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Monitor progress of subgroups to ensure that interventions, accommodations, and services are provided and make necessary instructional changes based on student need.

Person Responsible: Jodie Martin (jodie.martin@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing, with checkups happening every nine-weeks.

Remediation teacher will work with students identified by the instructional coach and Literacy Team as needing intervention. The Remediation teacher will use SIPPS, Heggerty, Bridge the Gap, Quick Reads or FCRR to implement the identified intervention needs.

Person Responsible: Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

The administration will schedule Professional Development during faculty meetings so that the Kagan coach can offer support to teachers in the use of Kagan Structures.

Person Responsible: Stan Ward (stanley.ward@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will receive professional development and ongoing support by the instructional coach to implement the newly adopted ELA programs, "Wonders".

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.ptillman@wcsb.us)

By When: ongoing

Students will complete 30-45 minutes of i-Ready Reading weekly as monitored by weekly usage reports.

Person Responsible: Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

51% of 3rd through 5th grade students were proficient on the 2023 Math FAST PM3 assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

53% of students, grades 3-5, will test proficient on the 2024 PM3 FAST Math test.

Monitoring:

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

State FAST Progress Monitoring data
District-Based Assessments (i-Ready Standards Mastery)
Response to Intervention data
IEP Goals

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Tillman (susan.ptillman@wcsb.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.)

Instructional Coach
Supplemental Small Group and Differentiated Instruction
Kagan Structures
Response to Intervention
i- Ready Math
Teacher Coaches
High Yield Routines
PLCs
Explicit and Systematic Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Administrators and teachers, along with district personnel, will meet monthly to discuss formative assessment data. These purpose of these data reviews are to guide instructional decisions including the differentiation of mathematics instruction within the classroom. The meetings will also create a watchlist of students that need additional support. The MTSS team will meet to discuss and review the data through Response to Intervention and IEP goals to insure that adequate progress is being made. The Instructional Coach will meet with grade levels to plan instruction to include High Yield Routines , model instruction, and monitor curriculum. Teachers will use district-provided materials to plan standards-based instruction. Best Practices for Inclusion will be considered when creating IEP's, student placement, and lesson planning. Kagan Structures will be implemented to engage leaners. Through PLCs teachers will plan standard-based lessons that are systematic and will use explicit instruction that provides scaffolding and differentiation to align with the B.E.S.T. Math benchmarks. A Title I remediation teacher will work with small groups to help with our underperforming subgroups. Also, additional paraprofessionals will be designated to work with the ESE teacher to help with the underperforming ESE subgroups.

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.

Administration will monitor student data and the RTI process to ensure interventions are implemented with fidelity using Explicit and Systematic Instruction. Administration will perform walk throughs to ensure instruction is aligned with the B.E.S.T. standards, Kagan structures are used for engagement, and differentiation is implemented based on student needs. The use of High Yield Routines will also be monitored for implementation and that is done with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Stan Ward (stanley.ward@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Teacher Coaches will support teachers through professional development, modeling, analyzing student data, resources, observations, PLCs, feedback and lesson planning support.

Person Responsible: Shari Smith (shari.smith@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Monitor progress of Subgroups to ensure that interventions, accommodations, and services are provided and make necessary changes to RTI plans or IEP's based on student need.

Person Responsible: Jodie Martin (jodie.martin@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing, with a review every nine weeks.

The Instructional Coach will monitor student data and the RTI process to ensure interventions are implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.ptillman@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Remediation teacher will work with students identified by the instructional coach and Literacy Team as needing intervention. The Remediation teacher will work to ensure that the students identified receive remediation on the math skills needed.

Person Responsible: Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

2nd through 5th grade students will complete 30-45 minutes of i-Ready weekly, as monitored by weekly usage reports.

Person Responsible: Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

20% of the Black/African American population at Medart scored proficient on the 2022 statewide assessments based on the Federal Percent of Points Index. This subgroup has underperformed two years in a row. (13% in 2021)

Measurable Outcome:

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

41% of Black/African American Students will score proficient on statewide assessments as measured by the Federal Percent of Points Index..

Monitoring:

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

State FAST Progress Monitoring data
District-Based Assessments in all content subject areas
Response to Intervention Data
IEP Goals

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stan Ward (stanley.ward@wcsb.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.)

PLCs
Explicit Instruction and Systematic Instruction
Instructional Coach
Title I Remedial Teacher
Differentiated Instruction
Kagan Structures
Response to Intervention
I- Ready Reading and Math
FCRR activities
Teacher Coaches
McGraw Hill Florida Wonders
Quick Reads
Heggerty Bridge the Gap
SIPPS
Weekly Science Labs

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Administrators and teachers, along with district personnel will meet monthly to discuss formative assessment data. These purpose of these data reviews are to guide instructional decisions including the differentiation of content area instruction within the classroom. The meetings will monitor the Black/African American subgroup of students that need additional support. The MTSS team will meet to discuss and review the data through Response to Intervention and IEP goals to insure that adequate progress is being made. SIPPS, Heggerty Bridge the Gap, Quick Reads and FCRR activities are district materials can be used for intervention. The Literacy Leadership team also plan differentiation and analyze the subgroups

progress. The Instructional coach will meet with grade levels to plan instruction, model instruction, and monitor curriculum. Teachers will use district provided materials, (i.g. - McGraw Hill Florida Wonders, i-Ready) to plan standards based instruction. Best Practices for Inclusion will be considered when creating IEP's, student placement, and lesson planning with the subgroup in mind. Kagan Structures will be implemented to engage learners. Through PLC teachers will plan standard based lessons that are systematic and will use explicit instruction that provides scaffolding and differentiation to align with the B.E.S.T. ELA benchmarks. A Remediation teacher will work with small groups to help with the underperforming subgroup. Also, additional paraprofessionals will be designated to work with the ESE teacher to help with the underperforming ESE subgroup. For Science, 5th grade will participate in weekly hands on Science Labs.

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.

Teacher Coaches will support teachers through professional development, modeling, analyzing student data, resources, observations, PLCs, feedback and lesson planning support.

Person Responsible: Angela Swain (angela.swain@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Administration will monitor student data and the RTI process to ensure interventions are implemented with fidelity. Administration will perform walk throughs to ensure instruction is aligned with the standards, Kagan structures are used for engagement, and differentiation is implemented according to student needs.

Person Responsible: Stan Ward (stanley.ward@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Monitor FAST, District Based Assessments, classroom assessments, and Response to Intervention to ensure that progress toward the goal is made.

Person Responsible: Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing data team meetings.

A remediation teacher will be hired to work with students that have been identified as needing additional interventions using Quick Reads, Heggerty Bridge the gap, SIPPS, FCRR activities through Differentiated Instruction for ELA.

Person Responsible: Stan Ward (stanley.ward@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Students grades 2 - 5, will work on i-Ready Math for 30 - 45 minutes in Math. Teachers will monitor the student progress and remediate as needed.

Person Responsible: Michele Lawhon (michele.lawhon@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

The 5th grade Science teacher will plan weekly hands on Science labs to increase student knowledge and engagement.

Person Responsible: Michele Lawhon (michele.lawhon@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

22% of Students with Disabilities were proficient on statewide assessments in 2022 and 38 % in 2021. (2023 is not available at this time.)

Measurable Outcome:

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

41% of Students with Disabilities will be proficient on 2024 statewide assessments as measured by the Federal Percent of Points Index.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Progress Monitoring data
District Standards-Based Assessments
IEP Goals

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.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.)

PLCs
Explicit and Systematic Instruction
Instructional Coach
Title I Remedial Teacher
Differentiated Instruction
Kagan Structures
IEP Accommodations
I- Ready Reading and Math
FCRR activities
Teacher Coaches
McGraw Hill Florida Wonders
Quick Reads
Heggerty Bridge the Gap
SIPPS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Administrators and teachers, along with district personnel will meet monthly to discuss formative assessment data. These purpose of these data reviews are to guide instructional decisions including the differentiation of reading, math and science instruction within the classroom. The meetings will monitor the Students with Disabilities subgroup of students that need additional support. The MTSS team will meet to discuss and review the data through Response to Intervention and IEP goals to ensure that adequate progress is being made. SIPPS, Heggerty Bridge the Gap, Quick Reads and FCRR activities are district materials can be used for intervention. The Literacy Leadership team also plans differentiated instruction and analyze the subgroup's progress. The Instructional Coach will meet with grade levels to plan instruction, model instruction, and monitor curriculum. Teachers will use district provided materials, (i.e. - McGraw Hill Florida Wonders, i-Ready Reading and Math) to plan standards-based instruction. Best

Practices for Inclusion will be considered when creating IEP's, student placement, and lesson planning with the subgroup in mind. Kagan Structures will be implemented to engage learners. Through PLC teachers will plan standard-based lessons that are systematic and will use explicit instruction that provides scaffolding and differentiation to align with the B.E.S.T. ELA/Math and Florida science benchmarks. A Remediation teacher will work with small groups to help with our underperforming subgroups. Also, additional paraprofessionals will be designated to work with the ESE teacher to help with the underperforming ESE subgroup.

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.

Monitor progress of subgroups to ensure that interventions, accommodations, and services are provided and make necessary changes based on student need. FAST test (ELA and Math) will be used for monitoring for all grade levels, grades will be monitored for ELA and Math for all grade levels, and Science grades for fifth grade. IEP goals will be reviewed based on the data and amended if necessary.

Person Responsible: Jodie Martin (jodie.martin@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing, reviewed each nine weeks.

Teacher Coaches will support teachers through professional development, modeling, analyzing student data, resources, observations, PLCs, feedback and lesson planning support.

Person Responsible: Bailee Mardis (bailee.mardis@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

The Instructional Coach will monitor student data and the RTI process. The Coach will make sure that the interventions are done with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Susan Tillman (susan.ptillman@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

IEP's will be reviewed annually. During this annual review, classroom data, teacher input, parent input, ESE teacher data, and progress monitoring data are used to develop goals. The goals are monitored quarterly. ESE teachers receive Quality IEP training to aid in the development of IEP's.

Person Responsible: Jodie Martin (jodie.martin@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

#5. 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.

In the 2023/2024 school year, 100% of students in grades K-5 will receive instruction in character education once a week during the special area rotation through P.E., using the district approved Cloud9World curriculum. Examples of Character Traits to be taught; Volunteerism, Kindness, Self Control, goal setting, etc.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Using Cloud 9, the students will be introduced to 70% of the Character traits assigned to the grade-level.

Monitoring:

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

- Lesson Plans
- Classroom Walk through
- Observation
- Reduced Referrals

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Cloud 9 World Curriculum

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Cloud 9 World is a research based PK - 12th grade integrated SEL- Mental Health solution that utilizes character strengths to empower children and teens to adopt character strengths and embrace mental wellness.

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.

- Walk throughs
- Observations
- Lesson Plan Monitoring
- Referral Data

Person Responsible: Stan Ward (stanley.ward@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers, including, Guidance and Special Area teachers, received the opportunity to participate in Training on Cloud9World. Ongoing trainings will be available as needed.

Person Responsible: Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

The word of the week will be Introduced by a Special Area Teacher and be posted in the lunchroom.

Person Responsible: Jodie Martin (jodie.martin@wcsb.us)

By When: Weekly

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).

The School Advisory Council meets and collaborates with stakeholders to review resources and address allocation based on needs and makes recommendations.

Medart Elementary will fund priority initiatives identified by the SAC through local funds as well as grants (Title I, Title IV, Title II and HIITS).

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

On the 2023 Star PM3 Early Literacy 54.8% of kindergartners scored Level 3 or above. On Star Reading 58.8 % of 1st graders scored level 3 or above and 57.3 % of 2nd graders score level 3 or above. The Data indicates that we should have Professional Learning Communities monthly to ensure that the best instructional practices are being initiated. This collaboration will ensure that teachers are supported by other teachers. Teacher Coaches will facilitate these meeting and record the meetings to ensure that they are implemented effectively.

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

On the 2023 FAST Assessment, 65% of third grade students did not meet proficiency, scoring below a level 3. Based on the data reviewed, the domain identified as an area of need was central ideas of Informational text. Data indicates that an instructional area of focus should be differentiated standards based instruction in ELA. Data driven Professional Learning Communities will meet monthly to ensure that the best instructional practices are being initiated. This collaboration will ensure that teachers are supported by other teachers. Teacher Coaches will facilitate these meeting and record the meetings to ensure that they are implemented effectively.

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

Using STAR data for Early Literacy and Reading students in Grades K-2 will increase proficiency from 57% to 60% of students scoring a level 3 or higher on PM3 statewide progress monitoring assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Using FAST PM data for ELA third grade and 4th grade students ,will increase form 35% to 51 % will score a level 3 or higher on PM3 of the statewide progress monitoring assessment.

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.

Differentiated Standards based instruction will be monitored through RTI plans, IEP goals and Classroom walk throughs.

Classroom walk-throughs and observations to ensure the standards are implemented with rigor, using official- school documentation.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) to allow monthly collaboration and professional development, which will be facilitated by Teacher Coaches and documented on the school PLC agenda form.

FAST student data, RTI Data, IEP Goals, and i-Ready Data will be used to monitor progress and to identify needs. Ongoing data reflection will be used to inform instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Allen, Amber, amber.allen@wcsb.us

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?

The resources below are identified as strong programs aligned to the district reading plan and to B.E.S.T. ELA standards for Florida:

PLC

Explicit Instruction and Systematic Instruction

Differentiated Instruction

Kagan Structures

Response to Intervention

I- Ready

FCRR activities

McGraw Hill Florida Wonders

Quick Reads

Heggerty Bridge the Gap

SIPPS

The following people will ensure that the above programs are implemented with rigor:

Teacher Coach

Instructional Coach

Title One Remedial Teacher

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?

Administrators and teachers, along with district personal will meet monthly to discuss formative assessment data. The purpose of these data reviews are to guide instructional decisions including the

differentiation of reading instruction within the classroom. The meetings will monitor the Students with Disabilities subgroup of students that need additional support. The MTSS team will meet to discuss and review the data through Response to Intervention and IEP goals to insure that adequate progress is being made. SIPPS, Heggerty Bridge the Gap, Quick Reads and FCRR activities are district materials that can be used for intervention. The Literacy Leadership team also plan differentiation and analyze the subgroups progress. The Instructional coach will meet with grade levels to plan instruction, model instruction, and monitor curriculum. Teachers will use district provided materials, (i.e. - McGraw Hill Florida Wonders, i-Ready) to plan standards based instruction. Best Practices for Inclusion will be considered when creating IEP's, student placement, and lesson planning with the subgroup in mind. Kagan Structures will be implemented to engage learners. Through PLCs teachers will plan standard based lessons that are systematic and will use explicit instruction that provides scaffolding and differentiation to align with the B.E.S.T. ELA benchmarks. A Remediation teacher will work with small groups to help with our underperforming subgroups. Also, additional paraprofessionals will be designated to work with the ESE teacher to help with the underperforming ESE subgroup.

All practices and programs have been identified by Just Read Florida as effective.

- McGraw Hill Florida Wonders series supports instruction in the key areas of literacy, including oral language, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. (Strong: IES Practice Guides: Foundational Skills to Support Reading; Improving Adolescent Literacy)
- Differentiated small and whole group instruction: McGraw Hill Wonders (Strong: IES Practice Guides: Foundational Skills to Support Reading; Improving Adolescent Literacy)
- Daily multisensory instruction in phonemic and phonological awareness; phonics; decoding fluency through the use of McGraw Hill Wonders, UFLI Foundations, and FCCR Student Activities (Strong: IES Practice Guide: Foundational Skills to Support Reading)
- SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words) provides a structured-literacy approach to instruction through explicit routines focused on phonological awareness, spelling-sounds, and sight words. It is supported through moderate levels of evidence according to Evidence for ESSA. (<https://www.evidencefoessa.org/programs/reading/sippsr-systematic-instructionphonologicalawareness-phonics-and-sight-words>)

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
<p>Literacy Leadership: School Level Literacy Leadership team will meet monthly to discuss and review literacy data and instructional strategies.</p>	
<p>Literacy Coaching: . Instructional Coach will attend Literacy Leadership team meetings, RTI meetings, Coteach in the classroom, support teachers with planning, provide instructional resources and strategies.</p>	
<p>Assessment: FAST, iReady and STAR will be used to monitor the progress and outcomes of literacy goals and focus areas..</p>	<p>Tillman, Susan, susan.ptillman@wcsb.us</p>
<p>Professional Learning PLC meetings will be held to review and support instructional strategies used in the classroom.</p>	

<p>Literacy Leadership: Literacy Leadership team members will participate monthly in .RAISE Webinars through PAEC.</p>	
<p>Literacy Coaching: Teacher coaches will be members of the Literacy team, support teacher with planning, strategies, modeling, and resources.</p>	<p>Martin, Jodie, jodie.martin@wcsb.us</p>
<p>Assessment: District Based Assessments and Systematic Instruction Phonics and Phonemic Awareness assessment will be used to monitor focus areas and progress toward goals.</p>	

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.

The SIP, which serves as the schoolwide plan, is accessible to the public in multiple resources and formats. An electronic copy is available on the district website, school website, Florida CIMS, and the Parent and Family Engagement Plan. How to access the SIP is also included in the Annual Title I Night presentation and school newsletters and communications, such as social media. A physical copy of the

SIP is available in the front office of each school, along with SAC schedules, agendas and minutes. All documents can be translated, as needed, by the district's Student Services office.

School Improvement & Accountability - <https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/departments/specialprogramsassessment/special-programs-and-assessment-menu/school-improvement-and-accountability>

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))

Each school's School Advisory Council (SAC) and the District Advisory Council (DAC) is composed of parents, district staff members, teachers, and community members. The DAC meets annually to review the Title I grant. At this time, a draft of the LEA Plan is submitted for review and feedback. The DAC must approve the District's Title I LEA Plan, Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP), and the process for allocating PFEP funds to schools.

Each school includes the PFEP on their SAC agenda for members to review and provide input into the school-level Parent Family Engagement Plan. During School Advisory Council meetings, parents discuss and approve different types of activities best suited to meet the needs of the school and parents. School Advisory Council meetings, to which all parents are invited, are advertised on district and school websites, school newsletters, and school marquees to ensure parents are informed of the meeting dates and times. SAC meetings are documented by agendas, minutes, and sign-in sheets which reflect input from parents on parent family engagement activities and policies. This documentation is submitted to the Title I office quarterly.

Schools host Title I events to build the capacity of parents to help their children at home. A 'link to learning' is embedded in all Title I activities to assist parents with understanding the state's academic standards.

2023-2024 WCSD Title I, Part A Parent and Family Brochure - <https://resources.finalseite.net/images/v1692381305/wakullaschooldistrictorg/slxtsepxqcuuvccqgqg/2324WCSDTitleIBrochure6.pdf>

Annual Title I Presentation for Parents and Families - <https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/departments/special-programs-assessment/special-programs-and-assessment-menu/title-1>

School Parent and Family Engagement Plans - <https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/departments/special-programs-assessment/special-programs-and-assessment-menu/parent-and-family-engagement>

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)

Area of Focus 1

Area of Focus 2

Medart utilizes several instructional programs to provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum such as Accelerated Reader and i-Ready Reading and Math.

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))

The LEA coordinates and integrates parent and family engagement strategies with other federal programs by providing transition activities for Pre-K students. Parents are encouraged to attend events like "Kindergarten Round-Up" to complete the registration process and learn more about transitioning into Kindergarten. Pre-K siblings of students in our Title I schools are invited to attend Parent and Family Engagement activities. Title IV, Part A funds are used to implement teacher coaches in our Title I elementary schools. Teacher coaches facilitate professional learning communities and support teachers in increasing positive outcomes for teaching and learning.