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## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Washington County School Board on 10/9/2023.

## 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. $6311(\mathrm{~b})(2)(\mathrm{C})(\mathrm{v})(\mathrm{II})$; 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 evidencebased 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 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), } \\ & \text { (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) } \\ & \text { ESSA 1116(b-g) } \end{aligned}$ |  |

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 mission of Vernon Middle School is to INSPIRE all students to value learning, ENCOURAGE all students to develop ethical decision-making skills, EMPOWER all students to live productive and satisfying lives, and EDUCATE all students to the fullest level of their potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.
Vernon Middle School will become a school of excellence.

## 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 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Seley, Niki | Principal |  |
| Tice, Brian | Administrative Support |  |
| Brown, Kimberley | Teacher, K-12 |  |
| Coleman, Kathleen | School Counselor |  |
| Rackley, Troy | Teacher, K-12 |  |
| Trammell, Cassidy | Teacher, K-12 |  |

## 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.

Stakeholders collaborate on previous and current data to determine contributing factors to trends and gaps in data and to determine a course of action and set goals for the current improvement plan.

## 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))

Stakeholders will continue to review data as progress monitoring takes place, students progress through the school year, and changes that are possible to take place throughout the school year as well. Any necessary revisions will be made based on the data gathered.

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 | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 23\% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100\% |
| 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 <br> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* <br> Black/African American Students (BLK) <br> Multiracial Students (MUL) <br> White Students (WHT) <br> Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History <br> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2021-22: C } \\ & \text { 2019-20: } \mathrm{C} \\ & \text { 2018-19: } \mathrm{C} \\ & 2017-18: \mathrm{B} \end{aligned}$ |
| 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 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| Absent 10\% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | Total |

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

|  | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 |  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| Absent 10\% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 12 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 32 | 21 | 60 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 26 | 23 | 61 |
| 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 | 3 | 11 | 14 | 28 |

## The number of students identified retained:

|  | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |

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 |  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| Absent 10\% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 12 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 32 | 21 | 60 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 26 | 23 | 61 |
| 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 |  |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator |  | K | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 14 | 28 |

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

## 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* | 42 | 46 | 49 | 39 | 48 | 50 | 34 |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains |  |  |  | 41 |  |  | 29 |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile |  |  |  | 32 |  |  | 20 |  |  |
| Math Achievement* | 45 | 60 | 56 | 47 | 42 | 36 | 33 |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains |  |  |  | 53 |  |  | 30 |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |  |  |  | 59 |  |  | 31 |  |  |


| Accountability Component | 2023 |  |  | 2022 |  |  | 2021 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 44 | 44 | 49 | 27 | 56 | 53 | 35 |  |  |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 58 | 62 | 68 | 66 | 54 | 58 | 55 |  |  |
| Middle School Acceleration | 27 | 55 | 73 | 35 | 59 | 49 | 44 |  |  |
| Graduation Rate |  |  |  |  | 38 | 49 |  |  |  |
| College and Career Acceleration |  |  |  |  | 69 | 70 |  |  |  |
| ELP Progress |  |  | 40 |  | 60 | 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 | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41\% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 216 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate |  |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| :--- | :---: |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41\% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 399 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate |  |


| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ESSA <br> 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 | 27 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL |  |  |  |  |
| AMI |  |  |  |  |
| ASN |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 43 |  |  |  |
| HSP |  |  |  |  |
| MUL | 52 |  |  |  |
| PAC |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 44 |  |  |  |
| FRL | 40 | Yes | 1 |  |


| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ESSA <br> 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 | 35 | Yes | 3 |  |
| ELL |  |  |  |  |
| AMI |  |  |  |  |
| ASN |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 42 |  |  |  |
| HSP |  |  |  |  |
| MUL | 42 |  |  |  |
| 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)

Washington - 0052 - Vernon Middle School - 2023-24 SIP

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | ELA LG | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELA LG } \\ & \text { L25\% } \end{aligned}$ | Math Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. |  | C \& C Accel 2021-22 | ELP <br> Progress |
| All <br> Students | 42 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 44 | 58 | 27 |  |  |  |
| SWD | 26 |  |  | 33 |  |  | 21 | 29 |  |  | 4 |  |
| ELL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AMI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 31 |  |  | 41 |  |  |  | 58 |  |  | 3 |  |
| HSP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MUL | 37 |  |  | 53 |  |  |  | 67 |  |  | 3 |  |
| PAC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 44 |  |  | 44 |  |  | 46 | 56 | 29 |  | 5 |  |
| FRL | 37 |  |  | 42 |  |  | 38 | 51 | 30 |  | 5 |  |


| 2021-22 AcCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | ELA LG | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Math Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS <br> Accel. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grad } \\ & \text { Rate } \\ & 2020-21 \end{aligned}$ | C \& C Accel 2020-21 | ELP <br> Progress |
| All Students | 39 | 41 | 32 | 47 | 53 | 59 | 27 | 66 | 35 |  |  |  |
| SWD | 16 | 33 | 27 | 27 | 56 | 57 | 17 | 46 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AMI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 39 | 48 |  | 53 | 71 |  | 10 |  | 30 |  |  |  |
| HSP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MUL | 35 | 41 |  | 45 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 41 | 39 | 30 | 46 | 51 | 50 | 29 | 67 | 38 |  |  |  |
| FRL | 37 | 37 | 31 | 44 | 51 | 59 | 22 | 65 | 31 |  |  |  |


| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | ELA LG | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELA LG } \\ & \text { L25\% } \end{aligned}$ | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25\% | Sci <br> Ach. | SS Ach. | MS <br> Accel. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grad } \\ & \text { Rate } \\ & 2019-20 \end{aligned}$ |  | ELP <br> Progress |
| All <br> Students | 34 | 29 | 20 | 33 | 30 | 31 | 35 | 55 | 44 |  |  |  |
| SWD | 14 | 18 | 21 | 14 | 20 | 18 | 28 | 27 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELA LG } \\ & \text { L25\% } \end{aligned}$ | Math Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci <br> Ach. | SS Ach. | MS <br> Accel. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grad } \\ & \text { Rate } \\ & \text { 2019-20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C \& C } \\ \text { Accel } \\ 2019-20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELP } \\ \text { Progress } \end{gathered}$ |
| AMI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 26 | 24 |  | 26 | 26 |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MUL | 50 | 21 |  | 13 | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 35 | 30 | 18 | 37 | 32 | 28 | 39 | 54 | 47 |  |  |  |
| FRL | 34 | 27 | 18 | 29 | 24 | 26 | 34 | 54 | 38 |  |  |  |

## 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.

| Grade | Year | School | District | School- <br> District <br> Comparison | State | School- <br> State <br> Comparison |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07 | $2023-$ Spring | $39 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $-8 \%$ |
| 08 | $2023-$ Spring | $46 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $-1 \%$ |
| 06 | $2023-$ Spring | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $-10 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $-17 \%$ |


| Grade | Year | School | District | MATH <br> School- <br> District <br> Comparison | State | School- <br> State <br> Comparison |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06 | $2023-$ Spring | $58 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| 07 | $2023-$ Spring | $43 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $-5 \%$ |
| 08 | $2023-$ Spring | $49 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $-18 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $-6 \%$ |


| Grade | Year | School | District | School- <br> District <br> Comparison | State | School- <br> State <br> Comparison |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08 | $2023-$ Spring | $41 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |


| Grade | Year | School | District | ALGEBRA <br> School- <br> District | State | School- <br> State <br> Comparison |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N/A | $2023-$ Spring | $41 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $-9 \%$ |


| Grade | Year | School | District | School- <br> District <br> Comparison | State | School- <br> State <br> Comparison |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N/A | $2023-$ Spring | $56 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $-4 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $-10 \%$ |

## 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 as a whole was the lowest with 6th grade the lowest of the three grade levels at $30 \%$ proficiency. Two contributing factors were a long-term sub in 7th grade ELA due to not being able to secure an ELAcertified teacher for the first semester and a first-year 6th grade ELA teacher with a noneducation background.

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

ELA declined from $39 \%$ overall proficiency to $34 \%$ proficiency. As stated above this can be contributed to the fact there was a long-term sub in 7th grade ELA due to not being able to secure an ELA-certified teacher for the first semester and a first-year 6th grade ELA teacher with a noneducation background.

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.

ELA proficiency as a whole had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. When averaging the gap across the three grade levels. VMS fell just under a 10\% gap below the state average with the same contributing factors of a long-term sub in 7th grade ELA due to not being able to secure an ELAcertified teacher for the first semester and a first-year 6th grade ELA teacher with a noneducation background.

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

VMS maintained in the area of math from the previous year with a slight increase of one percentage point overall. The greatest gain was in 8th grade science from $27 \%$ to $41 \%$. Science focused on studentcentered collaboration and a standards mastery approach that was successful.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.
Level 1 ELA and Level 1 Math students.

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

Student Culture
Tier 1 Instruction in Core Classes
Targeted Support for All

## 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.

Reading WIN Groups - What I Need Targeted (extra) support on Tuesday and Thursday

## Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
SWD who scored high L2 in reading will make learning gains

## Monitoring:

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

## FAST PM 1 and FAST PM 2

Classroom assessments Classroom progress monitoring

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberley Brown (kim.brown@wcsdschools.com)

## 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.)
Read 180 and individualized target lessons specific to skill needs with be used with these students of focus.

## Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
To provide added targeted support to intensive Tier 2 support

## Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)
Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

## Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No
Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.
No action steps were entered for this area of focus

## \#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.
Math WIN Groups - What I Need Targeted (extra) support on Tuesday and Thursday

## Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
SWD who scored high L2 in math will make learning gains

## Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
FAST PM 1 and FAST PM 2
Classroom assessments
Classroom progress monitoring

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

## Brian Tice (brian.tice@wcsdschools.com)

## 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.)

## Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
To provide added targeted support to intensive Tier 2 support

## Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)
Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

## Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

## No

## Action Steps to Implement

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

## No action steps were entered for this area of focus

## \#3. 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.
Attendance below 90\%
Level 1 students in math and/or ELA
Students with two or more indicators

## Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
By the end of the school year the number of students with attendance below $90 \%$ will decrease in number by $50 \%$.

## Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
This will be monitored by attendance in FOCUS and the the truancy process.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Niki Seley (niki.seley@wcsdschools.com)

## 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.)
Attendance interventions through family and community involvement and truancy prevention measures through parent contact, home visits, and attendance incentives.

## Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Truancy interventions have been implemented in the last year and a difference in student attendance has been noted. This positive difference in student attendance will continue with the continued support of parental and community involvement.

## 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.
Continued truancy prevention efforts of parent contact and truancy referrals.
Person Responsible: Niki Seley (niki.seley@wcsdschools.com)
By When: An increase in student attendance will be noted by the end of the school yea.

## 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).

When we see that a need is apparent, we contact the district and request funding for the needs that we have identified.

## Title I Requirements

## Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4)) List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan is disseminated in the following methods: Annual Title I meetings; SAC meetings; school websites; school social media outlets, and parentalinvolvement training that takes place at the school; As the plan is shared with the school staff, leadership teams, and stakeholders of the local community, it is articulated in a language that is comprehendible by the parent through the different focus areas detailing SIP goals and progress; Stakeholders are provided contact information in the event that more information is needed to support understanding of the SIP. All schools participate in the We Are CommUNITY day, supported district-wide to educate parents, and community stakeholders about school resources and after-school learning programs supported by Title I funding to support academic goals articulated in each school's SIP. The After-school learning program information is placed on various media outlets to establish outreach into the community and provide access to all students who need accelerated learning opportunities in the areas of reading and math.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

As part of Title I requirements, the schools priority is to support the district mission to provide access and opportunity for students to receive a quality education through fostering positive relationships that engage not only the student but families, parents, and other community stakeholders. The VMS provides two-way, meaningful communications with the school staff that involves the student directly and addresses and engages the family in school activities that promote success in attendance; literacy enrichment, and student academic achievement, graduation, and college readiness; Annually, the schools participate in a district college and career
fair that is lead by the district career counselor to assist in exposing the students to post-secondary learning opportunities; (You may want to add what your cost center does specifically to help engage families and how is the information disseminated) Examples include but are not limited to the following...

- Parent Nights
- We Are CommUNITY Event ( Promotes student achievement; fostering community relationships/training for parents on how to effectively communicate with teachers and school staff about their student's progress;
- Parent Training
- Open House/Family Night (....builds community)
- The districtupports school supplies for students to support the learning experience...
- The district provided calendars supported by Title I to support Family Engagement and promote awareness of school educational activities.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Title I- After-school Learning, and Summer Academic and Enrichment programs help increase learning quality and provide an enriched accelerated curriculum for students to be engaged. Each program is supported by certified instructors who provide intensive targeted assistance in the areas of reading and math; Credit-Recovery programs are accessible to students who need extra accelerated support to obtain the appropriate requirements for graduation; In addition, the district has employed an Academic Analyst supported by Title I funding to increase the quality of learning by providing teachers with data support to support quality instruction for students to advance in areas of weakness identified by progress monitoring.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The district provides support to all schools to help eliminate barriers for students who are experiencing homelessness, poverty, and mental health crisis; The district has employed a social worker along with mental
health professionals and guidance counselors to be an extension of support for each school by connecting
students with the following resources as needed: housing programs, violence prevention programs, adult education programs, and career and technical programs, etc. The resources provided are to ensure that all
students are supported with the resources needed to overcome challenges that interfere with academic achievement areas identified in the SIP.

