Wilkinson Junior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Wilkinson Junior High School

5025 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://wjh.oneclay.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

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.

Our mission at Wilkinson Junior High is to provide learning opportunities that increase academic achievement and cultivate a sense of self respect, accountability, and resilience within every student. As a school, we are dedicated to ensuring that every student receives a high quality education in a safe, supportive, and effective learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Wilkinson Junior High we believe it takes the collective effort among families, students, and the school staff to ensure a positive learning environment and successful outcomes for all students. As a school, we want to see parents committed to holding their student accountable and becoming an active participant in their student's education. Respectively, we want to see students acknowledge that their attitude, participation, and efforts determine their success in school. Lastly, we want to see our school staff continue to deliver high impact practices in an environment that promotes inclusivity and high expectations for all students.

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
Warmouth, Nathan	Principal	Principals
Rockwell, Jessica	Dean	Dean, Title I Coordinator, Co-Dept Head SS
Carella, Christopher	Assistant Principal	VP
Moriarty, Micheala	Assistant Principal	AP
Ammons, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	ELA, Dept Head
Campbell, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Science, Dept Head
Doughty, Steven	Teacher, K-12	Math, Dept Head
Eaton, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	PE, Fine Art/PE Dept Head
Ford , Linda	Teacher, ESE	Support Facilitator, ESE Dept Head
Phillips, Jeff	Paraprofessional	ESE Asst
Pope, Mylan	Teacher, K-12	SS, Co-Dept Head
Sanford, Tammie	Parent Engagement Liaison	bookkeeper, community and parent liason

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.

At the end of the 2022-2023 school year parents, teachers, staff, and students were surveyed for potential leadership, extracurricular, and SAC opportunities. Based on interests and results from the survey, the individuals on SAC were selected. All stakeholders were involved in the approval of the 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))

The SIP will be consistently monitored and revised for continuous improvement on a quarterly basis through data analysis during bi-weekly PLC groups, as well as data chats with administration team. Each quarter data from F.A.S.T PM's and/or district designed performance matters will be reviewed and utilized to drive further instructional decisions at the school level and within the classroom.

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 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	59%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	0	112	100	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	57	145
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	112	289
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	38	93
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	177	112	289

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	0	51	57	108

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3

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	117	117	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	36	87
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	88	144
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	51	89
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	80	79	159

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	0	51	57	108

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	117	117	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	36	87
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	88	144
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	51	89
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	80	79	159

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	0	51	57	108

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	46	54	49	44	56	50	49		
ELA Learning Gains				41			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28			36		
Math Achievement*	67	69	56	60	33	36	54		
Math Learning Gains				58			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			46		
Science Achievement*	65	62	49	61	64	53	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	82	81	68	79	59	58	74		
Middle School Acceleration	59	63	73	62	46	49	55		
Graduation Rate					63	49			
College and Career Acceleration					81	70			
ELP Progress		44	40		67	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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
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	54

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96
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	38	Yes	4	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	70			
HSP	64			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	59			

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	58			

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%
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	47			

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	46			67			65	82	59			
SWD	19			37			46	60	29		5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52			71			85	91	53		5	
HSP	52			63			72	77	56		5	
MUL	39			72			45	83			4	
PAC												
WHT	45			66			63	82	58		5	
FRL	41			63			62	80	50		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	44	41	28	60	58	55	61	79	62			
SWD	20	28	24	31	46	44	23	54	33			
ELL	27	18		36	55							
AMI												
ASN												

	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
BLK	40	35	27	53	50	50	50	81	73			
HSP	46	46	46	57	61	67	59	86	56			
MUL	50	48		50	56	70	63	88	36			
PAC												
WHT	44	40	26	61	58	53	62	77	63			
FRL	38	38	24	50	56	53	49	69	46			

	2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	49	46	36	54	46	46	63	74	55			
SWD	19	36	33	29	40	38	25	53	39			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	43	31	38	46	62	46	71	44			
HSP	47	51	75	47	35	31	53	70	60			
MUL	64	60		63	47		76	82	67			
PAC												
WHT	50	45	31	56	47	45	64	74	54			
FRL	44	45	43	40	40	40	56	66	41			

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	42%	52%	-10%	47%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	51%	-3%	47%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	48%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	73%	70%	3%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	66%	59%	7%	44%	22%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	68%	31%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	53%	47%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	79%	3%	66%	16%

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, 46% as a school. 43% for 7th, 48% for 8th. We were the only jr high to have increases in scores, although small. We had our entire first semster with 3 long term subs and did not have all ELA positions filled until January 23'.

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

None. All of our scores increased from the previous year. 21'-22' we were 5th, 6th, or 7th in almost all academic categories. The 22'-23' school year we had gains in every category. WJH increased all scores and were in the top 3 in all categories, except ELA, which was 4th in the district.

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, 7th grade. State average was 47%, we were at 43%. WJH was the only jr high to have increases in scores, although small. We had our entire first semster with 3 long term subs and did not have all ELA positions filled until January 23'.

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

Math, increased a total of 23%. Increased 9% in 7th and 14% in 8th. Focused on data driven PLC's and common assessments.

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

Attendance
Level 1 assessment Failures

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

1) ELA; reading/writing
2) Math; increase overall Math gains
3) PBIS; continue to decrease the number of referrals written

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.

According to F.A.S.T data from the 2022-2023 school year, 41% of seventh and eighth grade students were proficient in English Language Arts (ELA). Furthermore, data results from the past three years shows that our Students with Disabilities (SWD) population performed below 41% in ELA proficiency levels. Additionally, our English Language Learners (ELL) also performed below 41% last school year.

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase reading proficiency from 45.00% to over 50% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

FAST; PM1, 2, and 3 as well as Lexia Power Up.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

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.)

Explicit vocabulary instruction
Visual Representations
Frequent Student Practice
Provide Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day
Progress Monitoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Explicit vocabulary instruction. Vocabulary learning is effective when it entails active engagement that goes beyond definitional knowledge.
2. Visual Representations. Visuals help students make sense out of the content and direct attention, increasing the possibilities that the learners will remember the material.
3. Frequent Student Practice. Spacing out repeated exposure and engagement with concepts, practice problems, or skills over time bolsters retention, especially when compared to reviewing concepts.
4. Providing Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day. Research has shown that well-designed tutoring programs that use volunteers and other nonprofessionals as tutors can be effective in improving children's reading skills.
5. Progress Monitoring. Research has demonstrated that when teachers use student progress monitoring, students learn more, teacher decision making improves, and students become more aware of their own performance.

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.

-District ELA Specialist/Coaches to hold Professional Development on how "Explicit Vocabulary Instruction"

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of quarter one beginning of quarter two

We would like to incorporate Progress Learning and Vocabulary.com as a supplemental part of our ELA/Reading Curriculum; as it aligns with our current SAVVAS and State Benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: As soon as district curriculum council approves supplemental materials (Sept 14th).

Use visual models to represent strategies used to increase Reading skills

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter one

Interactive TV's (enhanced classroom equipment) to enhance student engagement, assist teachers with engaging and interactive lessons, and provided visual representations

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter one or beginning of quarter two pending when panels come in.

Target Lower Quartile, SWB, and ELL students through after school tutoring focus on Reading skills and other struggling standards/benchmarks).

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning quarter 2 after

District ELA Specialist/Coaches to hold Professional Development on how "Direct-explicit Instruction" using Corrective Reading and Spelling through Morphographs

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter 2 or beginning of quarter 3

Teachers will model explicitly how to break-down a text, annotate, and then summarize to grow in Reading Fluency/Comprehension (using supplemental reading materials that cross-content so students are exposed to different subjects)

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of the first quarter

Teachers and administrators will meet to disaggregate student data and create actions steps for all students based on the data. Teachers will also meet for professional development opportunities led by Progress Learning.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of quarter 1, 2, 3, and 4

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

According to F.A.S.T data results from the 2022-2023 school year, our SWD and ELL students performed below proficiency rates. Furthermore, data trends show over the past three years our Students with Disabilities (SWD) population performed below 41% in ELA and math proficiency levels. Additionally, our English Language Learners (ELL) also performed below 41% in both areas.

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase proficiency scores in both ELA and math to 42% or better for our SWD and ELL subgroup populations.

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

ELA and Math F.A.S.T PM 1, 2, and 3 data, Lexia Power Up, Aleks, and ELL access assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

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. Explicit vocabulary instruction
2. Visual Representations
3. Frequent Student Practice
4. Providing Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day
5. Progress Monitoring
6. Push in Support
7. ELL students enrolled in intensive reading
8. ELL students will receive Rosetta Stone program and educational time to use program

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Explicit vocabulary instruction. Vocabulary learning is effective when it entails active engagement that goes beyond definitional knowledge.
2. Visual Representations. Visuals help students make sense out of the content and direct attention, increasing the possibilities that the learners will remember the material.
3. Frequent Student Practice. Spacing out repeated exposure and engagement with concepts, practice problems, or skills over time bolsters retention, especially when compared to reviewing concepts.
4. Providing Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day. Research has shown that well-designed tutoring programs that use volunteers and other nonprofessionals as tutors can be effective in improving children's reading skills.
5. Progress Monitoring. Research has demonstrated that when teachers use student progress monitoring, students learn more, teacher decision making improves, and students become more aware of their own performance.
6. Push in Support. Utilizing ESE staffing specialists and ESE assistants to provide daily push in supports as stated in student IEP.
7. ELL students enrolled in intensive reading for systematic phonics instruction. Students will receive daily oral language acquisition to learn English.

8. ELL students will receive 45 to 60 minutes assisted language practice in Rosetta Stone to acquire the English language.

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.

Use visual models to represent strategies used to increase Reading skills. Use visual models and manipulatives to support and scaffold in math.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter through the fourth quarter

Use engaging supplemental online program to monitor student progress, assist teachers with literacy instructional decision making, and support student practice with B.E.S.T standards and reading comprehension strategies.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of first quarter or beginning second quarter

Target Lower Quartile, SWB, and ELL students through after school tutoring (focus on Reading skills and other struggling standards/benchmarks).

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of first quarter or beginning of second quarter

Teachers and administrators will meet to disaggregate student data and create actions steps for all students based on the data. Teachers will also meet for professional development opportunities led by Progress Learning.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of first quarter and throughout the remainder of the year.

Receive ongoing training from ESE and ESOL specialist and coaches to obtain best practices for meeting the needs of our SWD and ELL subgroups.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter through the remainder of the year.

#3. 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.

According to F.A.S.T data from the 2022-2023 school year, 62% of seventh and eighth grade students were proficient in math. Data results from the past three years shows that our Students with Disabilities (SWD) population performed below 41% in math proficiency levels. Additionally, our English Language Learners (ELL) also performed below 41% last school year.

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase overall Math achievement from 62.00% to 70.00% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

F.A.S.T PM 1, 2, 3; Aleks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

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. Teacher Modeling
2. Visual Representation
3. Providing Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day
4. Frequent Student Practice
5. Progress Monitoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Teacher Modeling. Modeling empowers students to begin their tasks with the confidence to proceed. It then allows teachers to monitor students who may need extra support as they struggle to implement the new concept or skill.
2. Visual Representations. Visuals help students make sense out of the content and direct attention, increasing the possibilities that the learners will remember the material.
3. Frequent Student Practice. Spacing out repeated exposure and engagement with concepts, practice problems, or skills over time bolsters retention, especially when compared to reviewing concepts.
4. Providing Additional Programs Outside of the Regular School Day. Research has shown that well-designed tutoring programs that use volunteers and other nonprofessionals as tutors can be effective in improving children's reading skills.
5. Progress Monitoring. Research has demonstrated that when teachers use student progress monitoring, students learn more, teacher decision making improves, and students become more aware of their own performance.

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.

Teachers model expected academic achievement through effective instruction monitoring progress through common Formative and Summative assessments.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter through fourth quarter

Use visual models to represent strategies used to increase Math Achievement

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter through fourth quarter

Interactive TVs will be utilized (enhanced classroom equipment) to enhance student engagement, assist teachers with engaging and interactive lessons, and provide visual representations.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter or beginning of second pending the arrival of panels.

Tablets available for tactile learners and student who need flexible setting. Tablets will allow students to manipulate and use a hands on approach with Aleks and district approved math games.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First quarter or beginning of second quarter pending arrival of tablets.

Target Lower Quartile, SWD, and ELL students through before school, after school, and Saturday school tutoring (using math data to focus on the benchmarks/skills students are struggling with)

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First through fourth quarter

Use of engaging tools and manipulatives to utilize during whole group/small group instruction to practice mathematic skills. Use of manipulaives supports the needs of tactile learners and learners with multiple modalities.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: First through fourth quarter

Teachers and administrators will meet to disaggregate student data and create actions steps for all students based on the data.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: End of first, second, and third quarter

#4. 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.

According to data obtained from district Synergy reports, 1047 students were referred during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase positive behaviors (less discipline referrals) from 1047 to under 800.

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

Synergy Systems, monthly behavior reports will be observed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

1. Establish Positive Connections
2. Schools and Families Have Meaningful Two-Way Communication (PFE)
3. Plan relevant instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Establish Positive Connections. Partnerships between schools and families can improve students' grades, attendance, persistence, and motivation.
2. Schools and Families Have Meaningful Two-Way Communication (PFE). Partnerships between schools and families can improve students' grades, attendance, persistence, and motivation.
3. Plan relevant instruction. Instruction that meets academic, sociall, socioeconomic, and multicultural needs will ensure that all students are getting the learning they need to be successful.

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.

Teachers conduct parent/teacher conferences to create a sound foundation/partnership between all parties

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of quarter 2

Teachers send positive postcards home (students will receive quarterly)

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter 1 through quarter 4.

Share important information through Synergy, ROBO calls home (or individual calls), paper copies of information, parent/teacher conferences (discuss academic/behavioral concerns and growths), meetings with the Principal, information on school website and social media

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter 1 through quarter 4.

Teachers engage in a book study to help inform decisions in the classroom

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of quarter 1 or beginning of quarter 2.

Plan and implement the following events: Annual Title I Parent Night, parent/teacher conference night, and parent family engagement events for ELA, Math, and PBIS.

Person Responsible: Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarter one through the remainder of the year.

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)).

Our main areas of opportunity are English Language Arts, Math, and PBIS. Additionally, we are focusing on our Students With Disabiliites and English Language Learners. Our scheduling this school year allowed us to have support facilitator push-in models to support ELA and Math, with a focus on our SWD population. We scheduled Students with disabilities, intentionally in order that the facilitator supports specific studnets each day. Our English Language Learners are placed into intensive reading classrooms to focus on reading skills to acquire the English Language. Rosetta Stone is also provided daily for independent, online instruction support for students to improve the English speaking and reading acquisition.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

n/a

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Warmouth, Nathan, nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

n/a

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

n/a

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
n/a	Warmouth, Nathan, nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net