

Walton County School District

Emerald Coast Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	14
III. Planning for Improvement	19
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Emerald Coast Middle School

4019 US HIGHWAY 98E, Santa Rosa Beach, FL 32459

<http://ecm.walton.k12.fl.us/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Walton County School Board on 9/19/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Emerald Coast Middle School is committed to raising the level and standards of academic achievement and meeting the needs of all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Changing lives everyday, so students can reach their full potential.

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
Griner, Kendall	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Mr. Griner is the School Improvement chair of the school. He plans and leads monthly meetings with the school improvement team in conjunction with quarterly meetings with the School Advisory Council. He attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that is related to school goals. He is responsible for implementing the school improvement plan.
Drake, Todd	Principal	Mr. Drake leads monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that are related to school goals. He is responsible for creating and maintaining the culture of the school and providing instructional support and feedback to the teachers.
Parker, Nancy	Assistant Principal	Mrs Parker leads monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that are related to school goals. She is responsible for supporting the culture of the school, implementing behavioral interventions and providing instructional support and feedback to the teachers.
Walton, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Walton attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that is related to school goals. She is responsible for working closely with ELA teachers to examine the school's data from the state and classroom assessments to identify areas of remediation to implement strategies to enhance instruction for student success.
Dobbs, Carla	School Counselor	Ms. Dobbs leads monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that are related to school goals. She is responsible for collaborating with school leaders to review school data and implement interventions for MTSS. She is responsible for implementing the school's social emotional support programs for students.
Wright, Karen	Paraprofessional	Mrs. Wright serves as a School Advisory Council member. She is the liaison between the school and the parent group, PACT. She coordinates parent

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		involvement meetings, events and fundraising activities
Burns, Lisa	Instructional Media	Mrs. Burns serves as a School Advisory Council member and secretary. She attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that are related to school goals. She also provides guidance with resource selection for the MTSS process.
Carroll, Donnita	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Carroll attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that are related to school goals. She is responsible for implementing the school improvement plan and to examine state and classroom assessments to enhance instruction and remediation of ESE students. She is responsible for implementing and supporting the Positive Culture and Environment goals of the school improvement plan.
Allen, Ramona	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Allen leads monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that are related to school goals. She is responsible for collaborating with school leaders to review school data and implement interventions for the MTSS process.
Agurcia, Karla	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Agurcia attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that is related to school goals. She is responsible for working closely with ELL students and to examine the school's data from the state and classroom assessments to identify areas of remediation to implement strategies to enhance instruction for student success.
Rhea, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Rhea attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and to review the STAR and FSA data related to school goals. She is responsible for working with teachers to implement Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that support instructional strategies.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Huggins, Kiersten	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Huggins attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that is related to school goals. She is responsible for working closely with Science teachers to examine the school's data from the state and classroom assessments to identify areas of remediation to implement strategies to enhance instruction for student success.
Caudill, Sara	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Caudill attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and to review the STAR and FSA data related to school goals. She is responsible for working with teachers to implement Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that support instructional strategies.
Cipriani, Kevin	Dean	Mr. Cipriani attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that is related to school goals. He is responsible for working with student's behavior and attendance to implement strategies to enhance instruction for student success.
Miller, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Miller attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that is related to school goals. She is responsible for working closely with Social Studies teachers to examine the school's data from the state and classroom assessments to identify areas of remediation to implement strategies to enhance instruction for student success.
Sagona, Brandi	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Sagona attends monthly meetings or more if needed to assess the progress of the school's goals and reviews the data from STAR and FSA that is related to school goals. She is responsible for working closely with Math teachers to examine the school's data from the state and classroom assessments to identify areas of remediation to implement strategies to enhance instruction for student success.
Hill, Camryn	Paraprofessional	Mrs. Hill serves as a School Advisory Council member. She is the liaison between the school and the parent group, PACT. She coordinates parent

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		involvement meetings, events and fundraising activities
Drake, Carly	SAC Member	Ms. Drake is a student and member of the School Advisory Council. She is responsible for attending quarterly School Advisory Council Meetings and supporting the implementation of the school improvement plan.
Klaudi, Tonya	SAC Member	Mrs. Klaudi is a parent and member of the School Advisory Council. She is responsible for attending quarterly School Advisory Council Meetings and supporting the implementation of the school improvement plan.
Klaudi, Sam	SAC Member	Mr. Klaudi is a student and member of the School Advisory Council. He is responsible for attending quarterly School Advisory Council Meetings and supporting the implementation of the school improvement plan.
Wright, Claire	SAC Member	Mrs. Wright is a student and member of the School Advisory Council. She is responsible for attending quarterly School Advisory Council Meetings and supporting the implementation of the school improvement plan.
Wright, Marshall	SAC Member	Mr. Wright is a community member, parent and member of the School Advisory Council. He is responsible for attending quarterly School Advisory Council Meetings and supporting the implementation of the school improvement plan.
Mitchell, Kristen	SAC Member	Mrs. Mitchell is a community member, parent and member of the School Advisory Council. She is responsible for attending quarterly School Advisory Council Meetings and supporting the implementation of the school improvement plan.
Mitchell, Kat	SAC Member	Mrs. Wright is a student and member of the School Advisory Council. She is responsible for attending quarterly School Advisory Council Meetings and supporting the implementation of the school improvement plan.

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.

Many members of the SIT and SAC were at Manufacturing Day to help to create this years SIP. Discussions were had amongst the group on how we would move forward in creating the SIP for 23-24.

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 SIT and SAC will meet periodically and review the SIP and discuss the effectiveness of the SIP. The SIT will look at FAST PM1 and PM2 data to determine if the achievement of the students meeting the academic standards is increasing. The SIT will discuss necessary changes to be made in order to better grow the achievement of the students.

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	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
	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	26	43	43	112	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	3	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	9	28	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	60	58	146	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	27	20	67	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	21	16	53

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	5	2	1	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	33	58	41	132	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	25	7	42	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	23	11	45	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	43	33	110	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	26	26	87	
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		

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	22	42	18	82

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	58	41	132	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	25	7	42	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	23	11	45	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	43	33	110	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	26	26	87	
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		

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	22	42	18	82

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	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*	63	56	49	65	57	50	67		
ELA Learning Gains				51			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			41		
Math Achievement*	82	76	56	78	44	36	72		
Math Learning Gains				66			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			62		
Science Achievement*	78	67	49	67	67	53	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	76	68	84	58	58	79		
Middle School Acceleration	74	74	73	78	58	49	71		
Graduation Rate					61	49			
College and Career Acceleration					79	70			
ELP Progress	53	62	40	68	75	76	72		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	670
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
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	41			
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	64			
HSP	51			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	79			

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	55			

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	42			
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	58			
HSP	55			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	58			

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	63			82			78	72	74			53
SWD	31			52			36	41	43		5	
ELL	12			36			40	17			5	53
AMI												
ASN	55			100							2	
BLK	56			72							2	
HSP	34			57			59	40	61		6	52
MUL	69			82			85	60	75		5	

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	70			88			81	81	75		5	
FRL	38			66			63	49	65		6	50

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	65	51	45	78	66	68	67	84	78			68
SWD	28	43	42	46	56	63	29	52	15			
ELL	21	36	34	37	51	51	31	44	60			68
AMI												
ASN	79	77		86	69				90			
BLK	46	67		62	58							
HSP	44	43	38	60	61	59	50	59	73			67
MUL	68	58		81	77			85				
PAC												
WHT	70	52	46	82	67	78	72	89	78			
FRL	48	41	30	67	63	62	54	69	69			73

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	67	57	41	72	64	62	66	79	71			72
SWD	26	40	31	45	51	55	37	41				
ELL	37	55	50	37	52	55	13	62				72
AMI												
ASN	94	69		94	54							
BLK	75			58								
HSP	52	50	43	61	66	61	56	76	67			72
MUL	72	57		81	64		77		64			
PAC												
WHT	69	58	39	74	64	63	69	81	71			
FRL	49	47	37	54	58	53	45	70	46			69

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	57%	51%	6%	47%	10%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	53%	10%	47%	16%
06	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	47%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	81%	72%	9%	54%	27%
07	2023 - Spring	57%	63%	-6%	48%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	81%	73%	8%	55%	26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	75%	61%	14%	44%	31%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	75%	23%	50%	48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	71%	27%	48%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	74%	-4%	66%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component with the lowest performance is the performance of our ELL students in ELA. The biggest contributing factor to this performance is the lack of English acquisition for these students. While there has been some individual growth for the students, their scores have not reached the proficiency level for middle school students. There has been an increase in support for our ELL students with class for newcomers and an intensive reading class. We also had a 6th grade ELA for ELL students.

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

The biggest decline in performance for the year was seen in Civics. We dropped from an 84% proficiency rate in Civics to a 71% rate in 2023. It is challenging to pinpoint a specific reason for the drop. The concordant reading score drop certainly had an impact on the overall proficiency rate.

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.

We are performing higher than the state average in most areas. We need to focus on our ESE and ELL subgroups to close the gap for those students.

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

Our biggest improvement in performance was seen in 6th grade math and 8th grade math. The proficiency and the growth performance of the students increased from the previous year.

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

Based on the EWS Data, our performance in ELA is a concern level. Many of those additional EWS categories are in good standing. We always monitor the attendance level of all students. There is a clear connection between attendance and academic performance.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement are the reading performance for our ELL, ESE, and Hispanic population. We will also focus on the growth of all students in ELA.

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.

The data of ECMS students scoring 3 or above on the 2023 PM3 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) is 58%. The target value for ECMS students scoring 3 or above on the FAST for the 2024 PM3 is 80%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the school year, 80% of the students will show proficiency on the FSA Reading Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly department meetings facilitated by a department chair to improve communication, collaboration, and data tracking.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Objective 1: The school will provide quality instruction, remediation, and enrichment so all students make progress performing at high levels in reading and writing.

Tier I The school will use STAR assessments. Content Area Teachers will: use CARPD and/or AVID strategies integrate essay writing ELA, Critical Thinking, and Reading teachers will use supplemental materials and AVID strategies. ELA teachers will: Follow CAP Set Book Goals Model close and careful reading Conduct cold reads Adhere to a vertically aligned writing program. Students will develop a plan for growth.

Objective 2: The school will provide enrichment for students performing at high levels.

Tier II Students performing above average may take Advanced Language Arts classes in grades 6-8.

Objective 3: The school will target struggling students and assist them in showing growth.

Tier III Struggling students will be placed in Intensive Reading. Tier III MTSS will monitor struggling students and discuss strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale - FSA scores Language Arts, Critical Thinking, and Reading teachers will use an assortment of supplemental reading materials and AVID strategies to include Jamestown, Achieve 3000, novels, SCOPE, ZINC, Khan Academy, digital books, Tween Tribune, Reading A-Z packs, Max Scholar, Saddleback Reading Series, Common Lit, NewsELA, Quill and Brain Pop to address literary elements, vocabulary, author's purpose, and FSA Reading reporting categories.

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.

A department chair will be appointed to facilitate communication and collaboration among ELA teachers, reading teachers, critical thinking teachers, and the media specialist.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

The school will use district approved assessments at regular intervals four times during the 2023-2024 school year. Teachers will use data to determine and differentiate classroom instruction.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

Language Arts and Critical Thinking teachers may set Book Goals by grade level, course, and/ or student ability to encourage leisure reading skills, improve comprehension skills, and build endurance. Access to digital books will be made available. Audio/Digital books and/or Graphic Novels in conjunction with written texts will also be made available to students to reinforce fluency, comprehension, and interests and to improve listening skills.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

Teachers will adhere to a vertically aligned writing program. This instruction will grow cumulatively and introduce new skills each successive school year. Students will compose essays that develop the critical thinking skills needed to become successful writers and thinkers. Content area teachers will integrate writing quality paragraphs citing information from 1-3 sources into Social Studies and Science classes using teacher-created templates.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

Selected teachers attend state AVID conference and then share strategies and training during staff meetings in order for all teachers to use AVID strategies across the curriculum.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

Language Arts and Reading teachers will follow the curriculum designed by CAP/SpringBoard and attend a district-wide workshop and share strategies and training during staff meetings as needed.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

Teachers will model close and careful reading strategies of complex texts. Discussion of texts will include higher order questions to determine students' depth of knowledge.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

Students will use information from assessments and general performance on class assignments to individually determine their reading strengths and weaknesses, to identify obstacles that may prevent success, and to set personal goals with an action plan that encourages growth.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

A district approved assessment will be used to place struggling students into the Intensive Reading program. This class will use Achieve 3000 as a core curriculum with various supplemental, high interest materials that may include Action, Jamestown, and Great Educators.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

MTSS will monitor the progress of individual struggling students and discuss strategies to target areas for improvement. Teachers will work with students and administration to provide materials/supplies as needed, to include books in Spanish, audio books, Fisher Hill/ Saddleback Reading Series materials for reading, writing, and grammar skills.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

ELA teachers will support the Civics curriculum through text-based literature as outlined by the Florida BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of 2023-2024 school year

#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.

In 2022-2023, ECMS students scoring 3 or above on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3 is 82%. The target value for ECMS students scoring 3 or above on the 2024 FAST PM3 is 85%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the school year, 85% of the students will show proficiency on the FAST Math Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly department meetings facilitated by a department chair to improve communication, collaboration, and data tracking.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Objective #1: The school will provide quality instruction, remediation, and enrichment opportunities so that all students make continuous progress toward performing at high levels in Mathematics.

Tier I

Math teachers will implement the district adopted curriculum and utilize the pacing guide created during CAP.

Strategies will be implemented throughout the year in math classes to encourage self regulation and accountability.

Teachers will implement technology resources to encourage problem solving skills in real world settings.

Tier II

Teachers from the previous year will provide recommendations for Advanced and Intensive courses based on student performance data.

Teachers will provide students with a variety of technology resources, such as adaptive or tutorial, to aid in understanding of math concepts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Math teachers will provide intensive math support utilizing online individualized learning programs that include but are not limited to Khan Academy, Xtra Math, and Study Island.

Math teachers will meet monthly with colleagues who teach the same course to collaborate on DOK levels, higher order questioning, and differentiated instruction to address FSA math reporting categories and STAR scores.

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.

1. STAR testing at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline, at midyear, and at the end of the year throughout the school year
2. Daily integration of differentiated strategies and provide opportunities for each learner to be challenged at his or her learning level while filling any gaps of understanding
3. Integration of intentional higher order questioning through teacher collaboration
4. Integration of learning targets through teacher collaboration and student interaction
5. Integration of real-world application of mathematical concepts
6. CAP: math teachers attend a district-wide workshop and share strategies and training with other staff members.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: By end of 2023-2024 school year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**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 2022-2023, 50% of ECMS Professional Learning Community meetings included discussions on questions 3 & 4 of the PLC Process. The target value for ECMS Professional Learning Community meetings including discussions on questions 3 & 4 of the PLC Process is 80%.

Question 3 is: What will we do when student's have not learned it?

Question 4 is: What will we do when student's already know it?

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 2023-2024 school year, ECMS Professional Learning Community meetings including discussions on questions 3 & 4 of the PLC Process is 80%.

Monitoring:

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

Objective #1: Use of Professional Learning Communities for the improvement of student academic and behavioral performance or other data-driven professional learning need.

Tier I

Each PLC will (a) research effective instructional strategies, (b) agree upon and implement common strategy(ies) with selected student groups, (c) implement common assessment for data collection (d) analyze impact on student achievement levels through collected data.

PLC members will observe other teachers to see a specific, effective, and positive strategy implemented to include pre/post meetings.

Objective #2: To increase the effectiveness and uniformity of PLC processes at ECMS.

Tier I

PLC Leaders and members will use the provided guidelines for PLC processes, related forms for meeting minutes, and district rubrics to evaluate PLC functionality.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Educational best practices identify the use of small learning communities as one of the most effective methods of promoting professional learning and introducing new concepts to a school faculty. Use of professional learning communities is also a requirement of the federal Title 1 programs, the Florida Differentiated Accountability Program, the Florida Professional Learning Protocol and the AdvancEd Accreditation System.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through common planning, PLC's will share best practices for some of the following instructional strategies: achievement level descriptors, standard alignment, higher order questioning, progress monitoring and cross-curriculum instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. All teachers will be encouraged to select a PLC during the week of pre-planning.
2. PLCs will meet during the school day, twice per month per common planning or after school.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: By end of 2023-2024 school year

#4. 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 2022-2023, teachers were not taking advantage of the PACT Grants to help obtain the resources to supplement the teaching of the standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023-24, increase teacher PACT grant applications to 75% of staff.

Monitoring:

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

1. ECMS bookkeeper in a partnership with ECMS PACT will check-in quarterly to determine where we are with funding.
2. Mid Year check in on number of grant applications. Push again in January if goal not met by December 2023.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Wright (karen.wright@walton.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

1. Provide items and curriculum aids requested by teachers through grants to help teachers teach standards.
2. Advertise sponsorships
3. Advertise grant applications for teachers to apply

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The above strategies will be met with the following criteria:

The participation of the teachers in the grant application process and sponsorships from the community.

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.

1. Advertise grant applications for teachers to apply
2. Increased sponsorship presence on school website and social media.
3. Provide items and curriculum aids requested by teachers through grants to help teachers teach standards.

Person Responsible: Karen Wright (karen.wright@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: By end of 2023-2024 school year

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**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 most recent data from the 2022-2023 school year indicated that 70% of ECMS students scored a 3 or above on the Civics EOC. The target value for ECMS students scoring 3 or above on the Civics EOC for the 2023-2024 school year will be 80%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 80% of students will show proficiency on the Civics EOC.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly department meetings facilitated by the department chair to improve communication, collaboration, and data tracking. District benchmark assessments will be given two times throughout the year which track standards-based growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Objective #1: Throughout the school year, the school will provide quality instruction and enrichment opportunities so that all students make continuous progress towards performing at high levels in Civics.
Objective #2: Throughout the year, teachers will provide students with current Civics articles and digital resources to promote reading and writing while connecting learning to real-world Civics.
Objective # 3 Throughout the year, students will identify and become proficient with the Civics EOC benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Civics teachers will use CommonLit articles, AVID strategies and other digital technology resources to differentiate instruction to meet individual needs. Students will monitor the mastery of the standards and learning targets by documenting their progress.

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.

1. Implementation of Civics Benchmark Assessment
2. Integration of learning targets through teacher collaboration and student interaction
3. Implementation of intentional higher order questioning

4. Offer opportunities to achieve goals through differentiation and individualized instruction
5. Continuously monitor and review state standards to fill voids in learning.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: By end of 2023-2024 school year

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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 most recent data from the 2022-2023 school year indicated that 75% of ECMS students scored a 3 or above on the Florida Standards Science Assessment (FSSA). The target value for ECMS students scoring 3 or above on the FSA for the 2023-2024 school year will be 80%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 80% of students will show proficiency on the FSSA Science assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly department meetings facilitated by the department chair to improve communication, collaboration, and data tracking. District benchmark assessments will be given three times throughout the year which track standards-based growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Objective #1: Throughout the school year, the school will provide quality instruction and enrichment opportunities so that all students make continuous progress towards performing at high levels in Science.
TIER I

Throughout the year, teachers will provide at least (8) high level hands-on science lab activities for students, including virtual labs and demonstrations.

TIER II

Teachers from the previous year will provide recommendations for elective and advanced courses. This will include STEM and Robotics classes that will enhance student performance.

TIER III

All Advanced 8th grade science students will be required to complete a science project utilizing the scientific method with the option to participate in the Walton County Science Fair.

Objective #2: Throughout the year teachers will provide students with current science articles and digital resources to promote reading and writing while connecting learning to real-world science.

Objective # 3 Throughout the year students will identify and become proficient with the Florida Science Standards in their grade level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale-Students can learn about science by experiencing hands-on science activities through science labs and experimentation. Science teachers will use Science World Magazine, Study Island, AVID strategies and other digital technology resources to differentiate instruction to meet individual needs. Students will monitor the mastery of the standards and learning targets by documenting their progress.

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.

1. Implementation of Science Benchmark Assessment
2. Integration of learning targets through teacher collaboration and student interaction
3. Integration of real-world application projects and hands-on experiments
4. Implementation of intentional higher order questioning
5. STEM and Robotics electives
6. Offer opportunities to achieve goals through differentiation and individualized instruction
7. Continuously monitor and review state standards to fill voids in learning.

Person Responsible: Todd Drake (todd.drake@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: By end of 2023-2024 school year