
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 0 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 27 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Shadeville Elementary School

45 WARRIOR WAY, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://ses.wakullaschooldistrict.org/>

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Shadeville Elementary School supports the District's Mission: To cultivate opportunities for students to become lifelong learners by offering a rigorous, relevant, and safe learning environment. Students will explore their interests and passions and develop the resiliency to succeed in today's society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Shadeville Elementary School's Administration, Faculty, and Staff support the District's Vision: To empower students, families, and communities to support student learning and growth through rigor, resiliency, and relevance.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Wheeler, Timothy | Principal | |
| Rodgers, Eden | Assistant Principal | |
| Hatfield, Heather | Instructional Coach | |
| Samlal, Sarojanie | Teacher, ESE | |
| Lima, Katherine | Teacher, K-12 | Kindergarten Team Leader |
| Reeves, Kay | Teacher, K-12 | Second Grade Team Leader |
| Millender, Jeana | Teacher, K-12 | Third Grade Team Leader |
| McCord, Suzanne | Teacher, K-12 | Fifth Grade Team Leader |
| Simurra, Linda | School Counselor | Guidance, Rti |
| Everton, Mandy | Teacher, K-12 | First Grade Team Leader |
| Garrett, Allison | Teacher, K-12 | Fourth Grade Team Leader |
| Leavine, Hannah | Instructional Technology | Media |

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.

Shadeville's School Advisory Council (SAC) comprises the principal, teachers, staff, and parents who are representative of the racial, ethnic and economic community. Students with disabilities are represented by ESE certified teachers. The SAC meets a minimum of four times annually to review data, develop, discuss, and revise school improvement goals.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The four scheduled SAC meetings will be held to review data collected from each progress monitoring assessment. Students performing in the lowest quartile will be identified and strategies to improve the rigor and relevance of instruction to ensure that there is continuous improvement will be adjusted in the SIP. Teacher needs for professional development activities and continued professional learning communities to implement State academic standards will be reviewed and revised.

| Demographic Data | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 17% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 73% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Identification | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |

| | |
|--|--|
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 24 | 28 | 30 | 26 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

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 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

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 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

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 | 43 | 24 | 22 | 22 | 32 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 5 | 3 | 14 | 8 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 6 | 13 | 8 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 25 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 23 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 13 | 26 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 15 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 43 | 24 | 22 | 22 | 32 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 5 | 3 | 14 | 8 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 6 | 13 | 8 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 25 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 23 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 13 | 26 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 15 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2022 | | | 2019 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 57 | 63 | 56 | 71 | 68 | 57 |
| ELA Learning Gains | 58 | 61 | 61 | 64 | 59 | 58 |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 51 | 51 | 52 | 43 | 47 | 53 |
| Math Achievement* | 74 | 68 | 60 | 74 | 68 | 63 |
| Math Learning Gains | 78 | 69 | 64 | 84 | 69 | 62 |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 65 | 61 | 55 | 70 | 52 | 51 |
| Science Achievement* | 79 | 69 | 51 | 63 | 56 | 53 |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | 0 | 50 | | 0 | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | |
| ELP Progress | | | | | | |

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 66 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 462 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 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 | 45 | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | | | |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | 72 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | | | |
| FRL | 57 | | | |

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)

| 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 | 57 | 58 | 51 | 74 | 78 | 65 | 79 | | | | | |

| 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 |
| SWD | 17 | 43 | 50 | 38 | 60 | 58 | 50 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 32 | | 62 | 74 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 57 | 57 | | 86 | 86 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 60 | 55 | 75 | 78 | 65 | 83 | | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 45 | 48 | 66 | 70 | 57 | 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 | 61 | 51 | 33 | 64 | 64 | 67 | 48 | | | | | |
| SWD | 30 | 36 | 18 | 37 | 52 | 50 | 14 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 55 | | 53 | 64 | | 45 | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | 73 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 53 | 29 | 66 | 62 | 55 | 52 | | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 38 | 23 | 53 | 53 | 62 | 29 | | | | | |

| 2018-19 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 71 | 64 | 43 | 74 | 84 | 70 | 63 | | | | | |
| SWD | 43 | 61 | 47 | 44 | 72 | 59 | 38 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2018-19 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | ELP Progress |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 71 | 74 | | 68 | 75 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | 55 | | 69 | 91 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 64 | 44 | 75 | 85 | 69 | 65 | | | | | |
| FRL | 66 | 61 | 38 | 68 | 84 | 84 | 54 | | | | | |

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 |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 59% | 2% | 54% | 7% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 57% | 61% | -4% | 58% | -1% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 55% | 0% | 50% | 5% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 70% | 61% | 9% | 59% | 11% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 59% | 3% | 61% | 1% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 77% | 64% | 13% | 55% | 22% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 57% | 7% | 51% | 13% |

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.

Although ELA proficiency exceeded the state average by 6%, it is the lowest area of achievement. Early Warning Systems data reflect that 77/323 students in grades three through five were in attendance less than 90% of the school year. This number represents 23.8% of the population of students in grades three through five. Of the 38 students in grades Kindergarten through five identified as exhibiting two or more of the Early Warning Indicators, 31 were in grades three through five.

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

Fifth grade ELA performance decline from 69% proficiency in 2021/2022 to 61% proficiency in 2022/2023. Fifth grade Math declined from 87% in 2021/2022 to 77% in 2022/2023. Based on the 2022 state assessments, the 4th grade cohort demonstrated the greatest need for improvement. This cohort was the 2023 5th grade group that was assessed. In addition to being a lower performing cohort, Early Warning Systems indicators also revealed that 25/105 fifth grade students were in attendance less than 90% of the school year. Of the 31 students in grades three through five identified as exhibiting two or more indicators, 10 were in fifth grade. The difference could also be attributed to the switch from FSA to FAST progress monitoring. It is important to note that in both ELA and Math, fifth grade exceeded the state average which was 55% in both subject areas.

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.

All grade levels performed equal to or better than the state average.

Grade Level School Average State Average

3 ELA 54% 50%

4 ELA 57% 57%

5 ELA 61% 55%

3 Math 71% 59%

4 Math 62% 61%

5 Math 77% 55%

Overall, fourth grade performed closest to the state average. This cohort was at 52% proficiency as third graders in 2022/2023. Not only did their proficiency improve as a fourth grade cohort, but compared to the 2022/2023 fourth grade cohort, they performed 7% better.

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

Data reflects that Shadeville students outperformed both the district and the state in Math and Science. The greatest improvement was seen in the performance of fourth grade ELA which was identified as an area of need in 2022/2023, and increased proficiency from 50% to 57%. The expansion of the implementation of Kagan Strategies and additional after school tutoring were two new actions which were taken in this area.

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

A potential area of concern is the high rate of absenteeism schoolwide. 159/641 students were in attendance less than 90% of the school year. this represents 24.8% of the student population. Based on 2021/2022 data, there is a need to focus on the performance gap in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities.

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

1. Continued effort to close performance gaps in ELA.
2. Need for more resources to improve performance of Students with Disabilities.(pull out resource teachers)
3. Continued instruction in foundational skills to ensure gaps are closed and students continue to be successful at higher levels.
4. Availability of a class set of laptops.

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 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.

2022/2023 FAST PM3 data reflect that 64% of students in grades 3-5 scored at or above proficiency level.

1. We would like to see at least 67% of our students at proficiency level on the 2023/2024 FAST PM3 assessment. This would be a 3% improvement. Per the district's 5-year strategic plan, best practices recommend an aim of between 3% and 5% goal for improvement.

2. Students with disabilities show the largest gap in performance. We would like to see a minimum of 3% learning gains for students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023/2024 school year, 67% of students in grades 3-5 will score at or above the state proficiency level on the FAST PM3 Math assessment with a minimum of 3% learning gains for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs and observations

Quarterly data meetings (STAR Early Literacy, STAR Math, FAST, iReady Diagnostics, student grades)

Tiered interventions (Rtl)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

After-School Remediation

Common Boards

Collaborative Planning

ESE Inclusion/Resource Teachers (K-5)

Harcourt Big Ideas Math Curriculum

Implementation of Daily High Yield Routines (HYR)

Incentives for achievements such as Math Warriors

Inclusive/Resource setting for students with disabilities (per LRE)

iReady/Ready Teacher Toolbox

Kagan Strategies

Mentor Teachers

Response to Intervention/MTSS for remediation and interventions

Software - Freckle, Generation Genius, Reflex/Frax

Teach Town/EnCore

Title I Math Remediation Teacher

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A minimum of 60 minutes daily of grade-level Math instruction will be provided. Programs such as Reflex/Frax, iReady Math, Teach Town, and Freckle will be used to enhance curriculum and assist in

providing differentiated practice at all grade levels. Daily HYR and the daily practice of Kagan strategies will be implemented to motivate students and increase instructional rigor. SWDs will receive instruction in an inclusion/resource setting as deemed appropriate by the IEP team. A Title I teacher will work with students needing small group support to achieve mastery. The RtI/MTSS process will be used identify students needing tiered support. Instructional and Teacher Coaches will provide training and support through PLCs. Math fact fluency will be supported by a schoolwide incentive program. Mentors will support first year teachers to help hone their practice. All strategies are district approved/adopted as evidence based through current research and effectiveness in target populations.

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 will attend professional development on how to use online resources such as i-Ready, Reflex/Frax, and Freckle.

Person Responsible: Eden Rodgers (eden.rodgers@wcsb.us)

By When: Initially at start of year and then ongoing

Instructional Coaches will provide support and training.

Person Responsible: Heather Hatfield (heather.hatfield@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Effectiveness will be monitored by classroom walk-throughs and observations throughout the year. Administrators will review lesson plans and observe instruction, student engagement and interaction, and ensure that BEST standards are being taught with fidelity. Lesson plans will indicate the implementation of at least one Kagan strategy daily and the practice of Daily High Yield Routines.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will review all available data (FAST, STAR, iReady diagnostics, and student grades) to drive instruction and help close gaps in learning.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: FAST for 3-5 and STAR for K-2 at least 3 times per year at each progress monitoring assessment. iReady K-5 at least 4 times per year and ongoing as student needs indicate

Student data will be used to monitor the rigor and effectiveness of instruction and to differentiate instruction in order to make instruction relevant to meeting the needs of all students.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Students in need of tiered interventions will be identified through ongoing data review and supports will be provided as determined by the district's Response to Intervention process.

Person Responsible: Linda Simurra (linda.simurra@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Supplemental, differentiated instruction will be provided by a Title I remediation teacher and resource teachers at all grade levels to address student learning gaps.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Grade level teams will set Math fluency goals which will be positively reinforces at the classroom and school wide levels.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Set at start of year and monitored throughout the year.

#2. 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.

2022/2023 FAST PM3 data reflect that 56% of students in grades 3-5 scored at or above proficiency level.

1. We would like to see at least 60% of our students at proficiency level on the 2023/2024 FAST PM3 assessment. This would be a 4% improvement. Per the district's 5-year strategic plan, best practices recommend an aim of between 3% and 5% goal for improvement.

2. Students with disabilities show the largest gap in performance. We would like to see a minimum of 3% learning gains for students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023/2024 school year, 60% of students in grades 3-5 will score at or above the state proficiency level on the FAST PM3 ELA assessment, with a minimum of 3% learning gains for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs and observations

Quarterly data meetings (STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, FAST, iReady Diagnostics, DSBA's)

Tiered interventions (Rtl)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Common Boards

Collaborative Planning with Instructional Coach

ESE Inclusion/Resource Teachers (K-5)

Incentives for achievements such as AR Store, Word Count Goals & Reading Warriors

Inclusive/Resource setting for students with disabilities (per LRE)

Instructional Coach and/or Title 1 Reading Remediation Teacher

iReady/Ready Teacher Toolbox/Ready Material

Kagan Strategies

News - Scholastic, TFK, Kind News

Peer-to-Peer Reading

Reading Buddies

Response to Intervention/MTSS for remediation and interventions

SIPPs/Rewards

Software - Freckle, Renaissance AR

STARS/CARS

Teach Town/EnCore

Wonders

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Common Boards provide students with lesson standards and information to lend relevance to the content. Kagan structures are practiced daily to encourage students to work cooperatively, promote teamwork, hold students accountable for their individual contribution, and provide differentiated levels of engagement. The Instructional coach provides ELA resources for classroom instruction and Rtl. The Instructional Coach and/or the remediation or resource teacher works with small groups of students needing support to master ELA standards. SWD receive instruction through inclusion as deemed appropriate by the IEP team. The Rtl/MTSS process is used to identify and support students in need of tiered supports which are then provided. Reading capacity of all students is supported through Reading Buddies, Peer-to-Peer Reading and schoolwide incentives such as Accelerated Reader (AR) goals and store, Reading Warriors recognition, and earning t-shirts. All strategies are District approved/adopted as evidence based through current research and effectiveness in target populations.

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.

Instructional Coaches will work with teachers to provide training and support.

Person Responsible: Heather Hatfield (heather.hatfield@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Kagan Coach will demonstrate Kagan structures during faculty meetings familiarize teachers with how to apply new structures to increase student engagement and improve rigor and relevance of instruction.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Rigor, relevance, & resiliency will be monitored through classroom walk-throughs and observations with feedback throughout the school year. Administrators will review lesson plans, observe instruction, student engagement, and their interactions to ensure that BEST standards are being taught with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Student data from FAST, STAR Reading, STAR Early Literacy, iReady Diagnostics, DSBAs, and student grades will be used to monitor effectiveness and differentiate instruction to ensure rigor of instruction and meet the needs of all students

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: STAR (K-2) and FAST (3-5) at least 3 times per year at scheduled progress monitoring. iReady Diagnostics (K-5) at least four times per year and ongoing as student needs indicate.

Students in need of tiered interventions will be identified through ongoing data review and will be provided supports as determined by the district's Response to Intervention (Rtl) process.

Person Responsible: Eden Rodgers (eden.rodgers@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

The Literacy Leadership Team will meet as a Professional Learning Community (PLC) on a monthly basis to review evidence based practices to help guide a plan for rigorous instruction.

Person Responsible: Eden Rodgers (eden.rodgers@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

2022/2023 FCAT Science 2.0 data reflect that 64% of students in grades 3-5 scored at or above proficiency level. This exceeded the state average of 51% and the district average of 57%. We would like to maintain our students' future success by striving for excellence.

1. We would like to see at least 67% of our students at proficiency level on the 2023/2024 FCAT Science 2.0 assessment. This would be a 3% improvement. Per the district's 5-year strategic plan, best practices recommend an aim of between 3% and 5% goal for improvement.

2. Students with disabilities show the largest gap in performance. We would like to see a minimum of 3% learning gains for students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023/2024 school year, 67% of students in fifth grade will score above the state proficiency level. Students with disabilities will show at least 3% learning gains in the FCAT Science 2.0 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Chapter Assessments with remediation as needed
 Science HYR Spiral Review
 Science DSBAs
 Classroom walk throughs
 Quarterly data meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Hands-on science activities and classroom projects
 Science Kits
 Florida Science HM textbooks
 Curriculum Guides
 Online resources such as Mystery Science, Pebble Go, Teach Town, Study Island, Generation Genius, & Discovery Education
 After school remediation
 Kagan structures
 Common Boards
 Instructional Coach

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will participate in hands-on projects such as Project Learning Tree and Science on the Move throughout the school year. A variety of Science Kits will be available to teachers for in-class, hands-on experiences. Teachers will utilize the district approved textbook, online resources, and the curriculum guide to teach grade-level standards. Study Island, Teach Town, Mystery Science, Generation Genius,

Discovery Education, and Pebble Go are all online programs which will be incorporated to enhance lessons, and increase student engagement and assessment proficiency. Students will also be able to use these technologies to increase their knowledge of science vocabulary and understanding the scientific process. After school remediation will be made available to struggling students. Kagan Strategies will be incorporated, and HYR Spiral Reviews and Science DSABs will provide data to monitor student performance. When needed, the Instructional Coach will provide intervention ideas and materials. All strategies are district approved/adopted as evidence based through current research and effectiveness in target populations.

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.

Create schedule for Project Learning Tree and Science on the Move activities.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Science Kits will be made available for classroom use.

Person Responsible: Hannah Leavine (hannah.leavine@wcsb.us)

By When: As requested by classroom teachers

Teachers will have access to HM textbooks and workbooks, online resources, and curriculum guides.

Person Responsible: Heather Hatfield (heather.hatfield@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

After school remediation will be made available to target students.

Person Responsible: Eden Rodgers (eden.rodgers@wcsb.us)

By When: Second Semester

Kagan Coach will demonstrate Kagan structures during faculty meeting and share information via email. These will help students increase interaction and engagement.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will utilize online resources such as Study Island, Generation Genius, Mystery Science, and Teach Town

Person Responsible: Eden Rodgers (eden.rodgers@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

HYR Spiral Reviews, Chapter Assessments, and DSABs will be used to monitor student progress and achievement.

Person Responsible: Eden Rodgers (eden.rodgers@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will be provided with adequate computer lab time students to utilize technology.

Person Responsible: Eden Rodgers (eden.rodgers@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Classroom walk-throughs and observations will be conducted throughout the school year to ensure that standards are being taught and students are actively engaged in the learning process..

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Character strength development will be addressed through Resiliency Education Instruction. The revised Florida Resiliency Education Standards are intentionally designed to impart the value of resiliency skills in early grades, such as volunteerism, responsibility, and goal setting, and then support students as they demonstrate those concepts in higher grades. The standards embed concepts of civic responsibility through citizenship and mentorship to not only help students understand the value of these ideas, but to actively engage in activities and exercises that will prepare them to be upstanding, responsible citizens.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023/2024 school year, 100% of students in grades K-5 will receive instruction in education during weekly Guidance classes, using the district approved, Cloud9World curriculum.

Monitoring:

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

Lesson Plans
Classroom Walk-throughs
Administrative observations

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.)

Cloud9World Curriculum (K-5)
Kiwi Emotions (K-2)
Kagan Strategies
Positive reinforcement program (Arrow Store)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Cloud9Worlds is a research based PK-12th grade integrated Mental Health solution that utilizes character strengths to empower children to embrace character strengths and embrace mental wellness. Kiwi Emotions are age appropriate expressions of emotions to promote character development by teaching children ways to express how they feel. Kagan Strategies will be incorporated to increase student engagement and promote teamwork. Students will be rewarded by cashing in the arrows they have earned for showing positive character traits through the school wide positive behavior strategy in the arrow store. All strategies are district approved/adopted as evidence-based through current research and effectiveness in target populations.

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.

Teacher Training in new Cloud9World curriculum.

Person Responsible: Linda Simurra (linda.simurra@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing. Guidance teacher will receive initial training. The webinar will be made available to all teachers for their PLCs and to incorporate into classroom practices.

One Character Education trait will be selected weekly to be taught during guidance.

Person Responsible: Linda Simurra (linda.simurra@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

All faculty and staff will be informed of the Character word of the week to embed it into instruction and daily activities throughout the school campus.

Person Responsible: Linda Simurra (linda.simurra@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

All faculty and staff will be informed of the Character greeting of the week to embed it into instruction and daily activities throughout the school campus.

Person Responsible: Linda Simurra (linda.simurra@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Instruction will be monitored through classroom walk-throughs and observations.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing.

Effectiveness will be monitored by examining data on student behavior, referrals, and suspensions.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wheeler (timothy.wheeler@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Effectiveness will be monitored by classroom walk-throughs and observations throughout the year. Administrators will review lesson plans and observe instruction, student engagement and interaction, and ensure that BEST standards are being taught with fidelity. Lesson plans will indicate the implementation of at least one Kagan strategy daily and the practice of Daily High Yield Routines.

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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 SIP, which serves as the schoolwide plan, is accessible to the public in multiple resources and formats. An electronic copy is available on the district website, school website, Florida CIMS, and the Parent and Family Engagement Plan. How to access the SIP is also included in the Annual Title I Night presentation and school newsletters and communications, such as social media. A physical copy of the SIP is available in the front office of each school, along with SAC schedules, agendas and minutes. All documents can be translated, as needed, by the district's Student Services office.

School Improvement & Accountability - <https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/departments/special-programs-assessment/special-programs-and-assessment-menu/school-improvement-and-accountability>

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))

Each school's School Advisory Council (SAC) and the District Advisory Council (DAC) is composed of parents, district staff members, teachers, and community members. The DAC meets annually to review the Title I grant. At this time, a draft of the LEA Plan is submitted for review and feedback. The DAC must approve the District's Title I LEA Plan, Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP), and the process for allocating PFEP funds to schools.

Each school includes the PFEP on their SAC agenda for members to review and provide input into the school-level Parent Family Engagement Plan. During School Advisory Council meetings, parents discuss and approve different types of activities best suited to meet the needs of the school and parents. School Advisory Council meetings, to which all parents are invited, are advertised on district and school websites, school newsletters, and school marquees to ensure parents are informed of the meeting dates and times. SAC meetings are documented by agendas, minutes, and sign-in sheets which reflect input from parents on parent family engagement activities and policies. This documentation is submitted to the Title I office quarterly.

Schools host Title I events to build the capacity of parents to help their children at home. A 'link to learning' is embedded in all Title I activities to assist parents with understanding the state's academic standards.

2023-2024 WCSD Title I, Part A Parent and Family Brochure - <https://resources.finalsite.net/images/v1692381305/wakullaschooldistrictorg/slxtpexqcuuvccqgqg/23-24WCSDDTitleIBrochure6.pdf>

Annual Title I Presentation for parents and Families -

School Parent and Family Engagement Plans - <https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/departments/special-programs-assessment/special-programs-and-assessment-menu/parent-and-family-engagement>

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)

Area of Focus I
Area of Focus II
Area of Focus III

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 LEA coordinates and integrates parent and family engagement strategies with other federal programs by providing transition activities for Pre-K students. Parents are encouraged to attend events like "Kindergarten Round-Up" to complete the registration process and learn more about transitioning into Kindergarten. Pre-K siblings of students in our Title I schools are invited to attend Parent and Family Engagement activities. Title IV, Part A funds are used to implement teacher coaches in our Title I elementary schools. Teacher coaches facilitate professional learning communities and support teachers in increasing positive outcomes for teaching and learning.