
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Riversprings Middle School

800 SPRING CREEK HWY, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://rms.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.

RMS shares the District's mission, which is, "Our mission 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.

RMS shares the District's vision, which is, "Our vision is to empower 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
Sandgren, Joshua	Principal	
Pafford, Bethany	Assistant Principal	
Jamison, Lesley	Instructional Coach	
Dykes, Kelly	Teacher, Career/Technical	AVID
Thaxton, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	School Improvement Chairperson
Spivey, Katherine	Other	Assistant Principal on Special Assignment
Wester, Rebecca	Dean	

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 meets 4 times a year. The council is composed of the school principal and school improvement chairperson who are on the school leadership team, teachers, parents, and students. Members of the School Advisory Council are presented with the school data at the first meeting and help draft goals.

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 Advisory Council revisits the school goals at each meeting and looks at relevant progress monitoring data to make sure that goals are progressing toward being met and to make adjustments to goals and strategies being implemented as needed throughout the year.

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	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* 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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
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	48	42	62	152
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	50	58	143
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	18	19	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	42	36	98
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	31	23	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	51	40	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	24	45
	0	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	36	59	63	158

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

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	47	52	65	164
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	51	47	148
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	13	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	12	40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	33	43	121
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	36	41	141
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	5

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	54	44	49	147

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days								41	37	52	130
One or more suspensions								33	49	52	134
Course failure in ELA								12	18	15	45
Course failure in Math								18	41	29	88
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment								38	30	19	87
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment								23	39	46	108
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.								7	13	20	40

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	33	56	54	143

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	2	1	1	4

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*	66	61	49	54	57	50	59		
ELA Learning Gains				44			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			40		
Math Achievement*	69	67	56	54	36	36	62		
Math Learning Gains				47			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			41		
Science Achievement*	45	47	49	45	58	53	48		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	72	68	73	55	58	72		
Middle School Acceleration	75	68	73	66	45	49	68		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					75	70			
ELP Progress			40		71	76			

* 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	326
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	66			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	52			

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	39	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	42			

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	66			69			45	71	75			
SWD	40			40			14	47	80		5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	54			55			13	58	64		5	
HSP	73			59							2	
MUL	54			59			40	70			4	
PAC												
WHT	69			72			50	72	76		5	
FRL	60			54			22	59	66		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	54	44	36	54	47	42	45	73	66			
SWD	27	39	33	31	44	37	29	68				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	39	38	31	38	56	42	67				
HSP	19	33		44	50							
MUL	67	47		52	52		60	70				
PAC												
WHT	57	45	36	58	48	38	47	76	68			
FRL	41	37	28	42	43	39	32	63	49			

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	59	57	40	62	54	41	48	72	68			
SWD	29	38	45	35	47	43	21	43				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	55	44	40	55	50	19	80				
HSP	50	61		72	67							
MUL	56	61	46	53	44	43	33					
PAC												
WHT	62	56	40	65	54	37	51	73	69			
FRL	43	46	38	47	44	39	38	54	45			

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	62%	53%	9%	47%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	70%	64%	6%	47%	23%
06	2023 - Spring	62%	56%	6%	47%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	75%	70%	5%	54%	21%
07	2023 - Spring	63%	64%	-1%	48%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	53%	11%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	44%	45%	-1%	44%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	53%	37%	50%	40%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	62%	38%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	71%	1%	66%	6%

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.

8th grade Science. The teacher who taught most of the 8th grade science classes left in October. The position was filled by another teacher. The continuing trend is that teachers are leaving the profession and there has been a lack of consistency in our science department.

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

All areas of data went up from the previous year.

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.

Geometry: State 49%, School 100%
Algebra: State 54%, School 90%
ELA 8th grade: State 47%, School 70%
Math 6th grade: State 54%, School 75%

Consistent, experienced teachers who delivered rigorous instruction.

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

Reading and Math both increased from 54% proficient to 65% and 69% proficient, respectively. Our school took a hard look at the data, especially the FAST data from PM 1. Following PM1, our school used a September staff development day to sit together and look at the data from PM1 as well as historical data, and identify students who were on the cusp of proficiency as well as students who made significant gains or significant decreases in score. The identified students were then tracked through PM2 as well as through STAR testing during the year. Administrators used the STAR and FAST data to conduct data chats with each student prior to FAST PM3.

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

Math retention and FAST Math Level 1

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

1. Math
2. ESSA Subgroup of Students with Disabilities
3. ELA
4. Science
5. ESSA Subgroup of Hispanic ethnicity

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.

School average ELA proficiency increased from 52% to 65% as measured by the FSA in 2022 and the FAST in 2023. WCSD goal for student achievement is to increase proficiency in all academic areas by 3%. Last year's SIP goal was to increase ELA proficiency to 55%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

School average ELA proficiency will measure above the state average and ELA proficiency will increase to 58% as measured by the FAST during the 3rd reporting period.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Testing PM 1, PM 2, PM 3

STAR testing

READ 180 Reading Inventory

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Pafford (bethany.pafford@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.)

Supplemental/remedial instruction for students not showing proficiency on the FAST will address any learning gaps students may have that may be hindering their understanding of grade-level standards. Read 180 is an evidence-based program that provides students with a standard-based, customized learning experience that will bridge gaps toward mastery and will be offered in the classroom. Students with disabilities will receive educational accommodations as listed in their IEPs to provide access to curriculum and meet individualized student needs to maximize learning and growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

AVID is an evidence-based program that improves instruction and student engagement. This program increases student achievement and engagement by scaffolding academic and social structures that build critical reading and thinking skills as well as fostering collaboration among students and teachers. Teacher coaches, collaborative teaching, and the use of instructional coaches will increase student achievement by providing teachers with the professional development and mentoring they need to become effective teachers. The biggest influence on student achievement is effective instruction. Teacher coaches and instructional coaches will provide support for teachers in data analysis, instructional planning, program implementation, and much more.

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.

Summer professional development during DCT for classes instructing students below proficiency in reading (Read 180), evidenced through sign-in sheets and feedback in ePDC.

Person Responsible: Bethany Pafford (bethany.pafford@wcsb.us)

By When: August, 2023

Enroll all FSA Reading Level 1 students in Read 180 classes, evidenced through FOCUS class lists and student test data.

Person Responsible: Bethany Pafford (bethany.pafford@wcsb.us)

By When: August, 2023

Identify students in need of tiered intervention through ongoing progress monitoring and provide supports as determined by the district's Response to Intervention process, evidenced through FOCUS class lists and student test data.

Person Responsible: Bethany Pafford (bethany.pafford@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

Monitor progress of students using FAST, STAR, and Read 180 data through quarterly data meetings with the Instructional Coach, and monthly PLC meetings, evidenced through FAST, STAR, FOCUS, Read 180 reports, and PLC and Literacy Leadership Team meetings minutes.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

Collaboration between general/ inclusion teachers and ESE teachers for the creation of lessons that benefit all learners (Teacher Coaches/ ESE Team Leader), evidenced by teacher sign in sheets and Teacher Coach logs.

Person Responsible: Bethany Pafford (bethany.pafford@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

Use AVID strategies, such as Focused Note Taking, Close and Careful Reading, Graphic Organizers, Summarizing, Levels of Thinking, Questioning, Reflections, and Binders and Planners, in all ELA classrooms. AVID strategies are recorded in the AVID Faculty Handbook and submitted to the principal monthly. Evidenced by AVID lesson plans submitted in AVID Faculty Handbook.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

#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.

School average Math proficiency increased from 53% to 69% as measured by the FSA in 2022 and the FAST in 2023. WCSD goal for student achievement is to increase proficiency in all academic areas by 3%. Last year's SIP goal was to increase Math proficiency to 56%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

School average Math proficiency will measure above the state average and Math proficiency will increase to 59% as measured by the FAST during the 3rd reporting period.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Testing PM 1, PM 2, PM 3
STAR testing

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@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.)

Supplemental/remedial instruction for students not showing proficiency on the FAST will address any learning gaps students may have that may be hindering their understanding of grade-level standards. Students not proficient in math will be given additional instruction during the school day. Students with disabilities will receive educational accommodations as listed in their IEPs to provide access to curriculum and meet individualized student needs to maximize learning and growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher coaches, collaborative teaching, and the use of instructional coaches will increase student achievement by providing teachers with the professional development and mentoring they need to become effective teachers. The biggest influence on student achievement is effective instruction. Teacher coaches and instructional coaches will provide support for teachers in data analysis, instructional planning, program implementation, and much more.

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.

Provide DCT professional development during the summer for all math teachers, evidenced through teacher sign in sheets and ePDC transcripts.

Person Responsible: Bethany Pafford (bethany.pafford@wcsb.us)

By When: August, 2023

Monitor progress of students using FAST and STAR data, evidenced through STAR and FOCUS reports. Progress monitoring results are made available to parents and students through FOCUS.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

Collaboration during PLC meetings between general/ inclusion teachers and ESE teachers for the creation of lessons that benefit all learners, evidenced by PLC meeting minutes.

Person Responsible: Bethany Pafford (bethany.pafford@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

Use AVID strategies, such as Focused Note Taking, Close and Careful Reading, Graphic Organizers, Summarizing, Levels of Thinking, Questioning, Reflections, and Binders and Planners, in all math classrooms. AVID strategies are recorded in the AVID Faculty Handbook and submitted to the principal monthly. Evidenced by AVID lesson plans submitted in AVID Faculty Handbook.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

#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.

The federal percent of points index for the ESSA subgroup representing Students with Disabilities has not been updated for the 2022-2023 school year yet and therefore still shows our school as below the 41% minimum.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ESSA subgroup representing Students with Disabilities will increase their percentage of achievement to 41% or more as measured by the FAST during the 3rd reporting period.

Monitoring:

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

FAST testing
STAR testing
Read 180 data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine Spivey (katherine.spivey@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.)

Supplemental/remedial instruction for students not showing proficiency on the FAST will address any learning gaps students may have that may be hindering their understanding of grade-level standards. Read 180, Study Island and Generation Genius are evidence-based programs that provide students with a standard-based, customized learning experience that will bridge gaps toward mastery. Students with disabilities will receive educational accommodations as listed in their IEPs to provide access to curriculum and meet individualized student needs to maximize learning and growth. Students with disabilities will meet periodically with members of the school leadership team to review their data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

AVID is an evidence-based program that improves instruction and student engagement. This program increases student achievement and engagement by scaffolding academic and social structures that build critical reading and thinking skills as well as fostering collaboration among students and teachers. Teacher coaches, collaborative teaching, and the use of instructional coaches will increase student achievement by providing teachers with the professional development and mentoring they need to become effective teachers. The biggest influence on student achievement is effective instruction. Teacher coaches and instructional coaches will provide support for teachers in data analysis, instructional planning, program implementation, and much more. Read 180, Study Island and Generation Genius are all research-based programs that provide students with a standard-based, customized learning experience. Teachers are able to focus on specific standards or provide general content and review to all students in order to address all standards. Read 180 is used with Tier 3 students in ELA as described in the district Reading Plan. Study Island and Generation Genius are used with all students in science.

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.

Identify the students with disabilities at RMS, evidenced through FOCUS class lists and student test data.

Person Responsible: Katherine Spivey (katherine.spivey@wcsb.us)

By When: August, 2023

Provide professional development during DLC in the summer for teachers assigned to work with Students with Disabilities, evidenced through teacher sign in sheets and ePDC transcripts.

Person Responsible: Bethany Pafford (bethany.pafford@wcsb.us)

By When: August, 2023

Provide supplemental/remedial instruction for students not showing proficiency on the FSA ELA and/or Math, including Read 180 classes, as listed in the District Reading Plan, and evidenced through FOCUS class lists and student test data. Monitor the academic progress of students with disabilities specifically through grade checks, data from Read 180 and/or Accelerated Reader completed bimonthly by ELA and math teachers, evidenced through STAR, FOCUS, and Read 180 reports.

Person Responsible: Charlotte McCormick (charlotte.mccormick@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

Conduct periodic "data chats" with students with disabilities to review their progress monitoring test scores, evidenced through FOCUS, FAST and STAR data.

Person Responsible: Katherine Spivey (katherine.spivey@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

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.

The federal percent of points index for the ESSA subgroup representing Hispanic students has not been updated for the 2022-2023 school year yet and therefore still shows our school as below the 41% minimum.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ESSA subgroup representing Hispanic students will increase their percentage of achievement to 41% or more as measured by the FAST during the 3rd reporting period.

Monitoring:

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

FAST testing
STAR testing
Read 180 data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@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.)

Supplemental/remedial instruction for students not showing proficiency on the FAST will address any learning gaps students may have that may be hindering their understanding of grade-level standards. Read 180, Study Island and Generation Genius are evidence-based programs that provide students with a standard-based, customized learning experience that will bridge gaps toward mastery. Students with disabilities will receive educational accommodations as listed in their IEPs to provide access to curriculum and meet individualized student needs to maximize learning and growth. Students with disabilities will meet periodically with members of the school leadership team to review their data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

AVID is an evidence-based program that improves instruction and student engagement. This program increases student achievement and engagement by scaffolding academic and social structures that build critical reading and thinking skills as well as fostering collaboration among students and teachers. Teacher coaches, collaborative teaching, and the use of instructional coaches will increase student achievement by providing teachers with the professional development and mentoring they need to become effective teachers. The biggest influence on student achievement is effective instruction. Teacher coaches and instructional coaches will provide support for teachers in data analysis, instructional planning, program implementation, and much more. Read 180, Study Island and Generation Genius are all research-based programs that provide students with a standard-based, customized learning experience. Teachers are able to focus on specific standards or provide general content and review to all students in order to address all standards. Read 180 is used with Tier 3 students in ELA as described in the district Reading Plan. Study Island and Generation Genius are used with all students in science.

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.

Identify the Hispanic students at RMS, evidenced through FOCUS class lists and student test data.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Thaxton (jennifer.thaxton@wcsb.us)

By When: August, 2023

Provide professional development during DLC in the summer for teachers, evidenced through teacher sign in sheets and ePDC transcripts.

Person Responsible: Bethany Pafford (bethany.pafford@wcsb.us)

By When: August, 2023

Provide supplemental/remedial instruction for students not showing proficiency on the FSA ELA and/or Math, including Read 180 classes, as listed in the District Reading Plan, and evidenced through FOCUS class lists and student test data. Monitor the academic progress of Hispanic students specifically through grade checks, data from Read 180 and/or Accelerated Reader completed bimonthly by ELA and math teachers, evidenced through STAR, FOCUS, and Read 180 reports.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

Monitor the academic progress of Hispanic students specifically through grade checks, data from Read 180, and/or Accelerated Reader completed bimonthly by ELA and math teachers, evidenced through STAR, FOCUS, and Read 180 reports.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@wcsb.us)

By When: May, 2024

#5. 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.

One of the Early Warning System indicators is students absent 10 days or more. Currently that number is 152, which is up from last year's number of 130. This represents 29% of our student population.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease the percentage of students missing 10 or more days to 25% or less.

Monitoring:

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

FOCUS data quarterly

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@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.)

Research- and evidence-based school-wide absence prevention strategies include individual learning plans, access to physical and mental health supports, attendance incentives, and enhanced climate and safety.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The evidence-based interventions listed are already at least partially in place. These interventions were successful last year at meeting the goal of having less than 25% of students absent 10 or more days. We will add to these interventions (action steps) as necessary to enhance the positive school culture. In addition, the district has purchased the program, Cloud 9 World, to enhance resiliency at all levels.

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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Develop individual learning plans for students and monitor students through MTSS, using FOCUS and classroom data.

Person Responsible: Katherine Spivey (katherine.spivey@wcsb.us)

By When: May 2024

Provide access to physical and mental supports for all students as needed.

Person Responsible: Katherine Spivey (katherine.spivey@wcsb.us)

By When: May 2024

Develop attendance incentives.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@wcsb.us)

By When: May 2024

Enhance the climate and safety of the school. Install additional fencing and a front-door intercom system. Develop school-wide and individual incentives such as social events (dances, movies, etc.), Student of the Week, rewards for meeting goals in reading, to increase the positive climate of the school and encourage attendance.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@wcsb.us)

By When: May 2024

Implement with fidelity the district-purchased Cloud 9 World program for resiliency.

Person Responsible: Joshua Sandgren (joshua.sandgren@wcsb.us)

By When: May 2024

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).

School improvement funding allocations are determined by the needs of the school with regards to purchasing the resources necessary to maintain an encouraging and supportive environment for our learners. In the SIP Areas of Focus for underperforming subgroups, the interventions listed are provided by the district; school improvement funding will be allocated to incentives to support those interventions and to encourage student success and create a positive school climate. Allocations are reviewed quarterly by the School Advisory Council.