

Walton County School District

Walton Initiative For Success In Education (Wise) School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 19 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 19 |

Walton Initiative For Success In Education (Wise)

555 WALTON RD, Defuniak Springs, FL 32433

<http://wis.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.

The WISE Center is a collaborative environment built on differing programs with one goal: every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The WISE Center is committed to achieving a Commendable rating through EPIC instruction.

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 |
|------------------|------------------|--|
| Johnson, William | Principal | Oversee creation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan |
| Varnum, Amanda | School Counselor | Gather EWS data and test score data |
| Taylor, Lisa | Teacher, K-12 | ELA data, strategies |
| Cotton, Matthew | Teacher, K-12 | Technology, oversees behavior plan, student discipline data |
| Kendall, Tyana | Teacher, PreK | Budget, Behavior management |
| Kelly, Mallie | SAC Member | |
| Smith, Kimberly | SAC Member | |
| Bell, Sandra | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Thompson, Robert | SAC Member | |
| Watford, Wyatt | SAC Member | Student Representative |
| Maynor, Mara | SAC Member | Student Representative |

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.

To develop our SIP, faculty and staff members met to review data from the 2022-2023 school year and discussed goals for the 2023-2024 year. During the summer our team met to discuss strategies to implement for the desired outcome of student academic and behavioral improvement. Several parents and students met with the principal to discuss our behavior management process and potential motivational activities for students to work towards.

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))

Our SIP team will meet monthly to discuss progress towards goals by looking at classroom data, progress monitoring data, walk through notes, and formative/summative assessments. Data will also be shared at our monthly School Advisory Counsel meetings and disseminated to our faculty and staff during monthly faculty meetings.

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) | Combination School PK-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 28% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 88% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | TSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: MAINTAINING |

| | |
|--|--|
| | 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING |
| 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 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 17 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 25 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 21 | |
| 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 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 16 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 |

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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 14 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 14 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 53 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 39 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 15 | |
| | 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 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 16 |

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 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 14 |

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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 26 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 25 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 13 | |
| | 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 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |

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 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 12 |

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* | 25 | 57 | 53 | 35 | 62 | 55 | 30 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 44 | | | 33 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 29 | 68 | 55 | 33 | 42 | 42 | 32 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 40 | | | 46 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Science Achievement* | 29 | 64 | 52 | 50 | 70 | 54 | 63 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 40 | 82 | 68 | 40 | 65 | 59 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | 67 | 70 | | 55 | 51 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 81 | 89 | 74 | 73 | 64 | 50 | 88 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 38 | 72 | 53 | | 75 | 70 | 29 | | |
| ELP Progress | | 44 | 55 | | 62 | 70 | | | |

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 40 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 242 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 91 |
| Graduation Rate | 81 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 45 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 315 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 94 |
| Graduation Rate | 73 |

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 | 23 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 21 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |

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% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| WHT | 44 | | | |
| FRL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| SWD | 29 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 43 | | | |
| 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 | 25 | | | 29 | | | 29 | 40 | | 81 | 38 | |
| SWD | 19 | | | 18 | | | 33 | | | | 3 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 15 | | | 27 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 27 | | | 33 | | | 29 | | | 50 | 5 | |
| FRL | 25 | | | 31 | | | 29 | | | | 4 | |

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 35 | 44 | | 33 | 40 | | 50 | 40 | | 73 | | |
| SWD | 23 | 36 | | 26 | 32 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 33 | 46 | | 36 | 40 | | 53 | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 24 | 42 | | 32 | 37 | | | | | 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 | 30 | 33 | | 32 | 46 | | 63 | | | 88 | 29 | |
| SWD | 29 | 29 | | 20 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 33 | 38 | | 36 | 52 | | 67 | | | 83 | 40 | |

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| FRL | 26 | 40 | | 30 | 44 | | 50 | | | | | |

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 |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 62% | -24% | 50% | -12% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 13% | 51% | -38% | 47% | -34% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 10% | 53% | -43% | 47% | -37% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 11% | 59% | -48% | 48% | -37% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | * | 64% | * | 58% | * |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 29% | 52% | -23% | 47% | -18% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 24% | 72% | -48% | 54% | -30% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 13% | 63% | -50% | 48% | -35% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | * | 76% | * | 61% | * |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 21% | 73% | -52% | 55% | -34% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 14% | 61% | -47% | 44% | -30% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 75% | -25% | 50% | 0% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 14% | 71% | -57% | 48% | -34% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 23% | 80% | -57% | 63% | -40% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 14% | 74% | -60% | 66% | -52% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 27% | 78% | -51% | 63% | -36% |

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.

ELA reflected 82% of students scoring level 1 or level 2 on FAST.

Contributing factors: transient student population, lack of student motivation, attendance, curriculum needs and teacher turnover.

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

ELA scored decreased from 37% proficient to 18% proficient.

Contributing factors: transient student population, lack of student motivation, attendance, curriculum needs and teacher turnover, different assessment.

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.

Both ELA and Math proficiency school averages were 0% compared to the state average of 55%. This 55 percentage point difference is the largest in our data. This is contributed to the small number of 5th grade students tested: 2.

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

Our overall Math proficiency decrease from 26% to 23%. Although is is a decrease, it was a smaller decrease than ELA. Focused instruction on standards, teachers self-evaluating through recording themselves, and student incentives for improving scores.

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

Two potential areas of concern are the number of students scoring level 1 or level 2 in ELA and in Math.

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

Reducing level 1 and level 2 students in ELA

Reducing level 1 and level 2 students in Math

Increasing the number of students earning a learning gain in ELA

Increasing the number of students earning a learning gain in Math

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

In order to increase school culture, we are going to set a focus on our SWD. Currently 109 out of 233 students are staffed ESE. With almost half of our population in this subgroup, we feel increasing learning gains by focusing on higher order questioning will improve the culture of the classrooms by increasing positive student attitudes toward learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase learning gains, our objective is to have 82% of our students increase at least one achievement level or increase within level 1 or level 2.

Monitoring:

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

An area of focus will be progress monitoring three times a year utilizing F.A.S.T. District created formative assessments will be used, as well as walk-through data, classroom grades, and classroom formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Johnson (william.johnson@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.)

Exact Path and Common Lit will be utilized during TIER 2 instruction to monitor effectiveness of interventions. Students will also focus on higher order questioning and responding to the level of the question through writing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These programs are evidenced-based school board approved curriculum for use with 5-12 grade students. Item response will increase the students' ability to create a thorough response using text based evidence and increase comprehension.

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.

Students scoring below level 3 on PM1 will be provided Tier 2 interventions during their Reading/ELA class using school board approved Tier 2 intervention curriculum.

Person Responsible: William Johnson (william.johnson@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: Student progress will be monitored/determined by PM2.

#2. 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.

All of our subgroups are expected to behave and abide by our Merit/Demerit System. All students are entered into Liveschool and their Merit/Demerits are tracked annually and monitored on a weekly and quarterly basis. Students have the opportunity weekly to visit the school store and quarterly invited to a reward day. Teacher will also be a part of a book study to better understand students who come from trauma and how they behave at school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students who earn less than 20 Demerit points per 9 weeks will be invited to a behavior reward day.

Monitoring:

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

Students are permitted to "cash in" their Merit points weekly; however their Demerit points accumulate. At the conclusion of each 9 weeks, students who have earned less than 20 Demerits will be identified and invited to participate in the reward day.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Cotton (matthew.cotton@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.)

School-Wide Positive Behavior Support is an evidenced based intervention the WISE Center uses to reinforce desired positive behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using this School-Wide Positive Behavior Support strategies, all students are held to the same expectations and norms. As students are performing or displaying positive behaviors, they earn Merit points that they can "cash in" at the end of each week during their afternoon break. As students break rules, they earn Demerits which are associated with incremental consequences. At the end of each 9 weeks, if a student has earned 20 or more Demerits, they are not eligible to participate in the reward day. By immediately receiving Merits/Demerits students to have real time feedback on how they are performing towards the school's expectations.

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.

All faculty and staff has access to Liveschool so that they may add Merits/Demerits for students as they determine necessary following the school-wide expectation plan for awarding points.

Person Responsible: Matthew Cotton (matthew.cotton@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily Merits/Demerits are added as behaviors are observed.

Weekly Merit points are allowed to be "cashed in" in the school store during afternoon break as a reward for earning Merits throughout the week.

Person Responsible: Matthew Cotton (matthew.cotton@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: Every Friday Merit points are allowed to be "cashed in".

At the end of each 9 weeks, Demerit points will be totaled. Students who have earned 20 or more Demerit points will not be invited to participate in a reward day celebration.

At the end of the 4th nine weeks students meeting the set criteria will be invited on an off-campus celebration field trip.

Person Responsible: Matthew Cotton (matthew.cotton@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: Oct 6, 2023 Dec15, 2023 Mar 14, 2024 May 29, 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).

\$1,960

Being an alternative program with a large percentage of our students either performing below grade level, experiencing low motivation, poor attendance, or discipline concerns, this School-Wide Positive Behavior Support system allows Merits/Demerits to be awarded in real time and rewards to be given frequently enough that students see value in the program.

Funding will be used for behavior incentives for the first, second, and third nine weeks rewards day in the form of renting water slides, bounce houses, and carnival style games, and the fourth nine weeks reward day will be a funded off-campus field trip.

\$400

Composition notebooks will be purchased for each student 5-12 for item response practice.

\$400

Book study for secondary teachers working with and understanding students who have undergone trauma.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | \$400.00 |
|---|----------|--|--------------|----------------|-----|----------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---|---|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| | | | 0282 - Walton Initiative For Success In Education | School Improvement Funds | | \$400.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Composition notebooks for all students in grades 5-12</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | | | | \$2,360.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | | | 0282 - Walton Initiative For Success In Education | School Improvement Funds | | \$1,960.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Funding for reward day celebrations, school store, field trip</i> | | | |
| | | | 0282 - Walton Initiative For Success In Education | School Improvement Funds | | \$400.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Purchase books for 5th-12th book study.</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$2,760.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No