

Wakulla County Schools

Wakulla Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Wakulla Middle School

22 JEAN DR, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://wms.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.

Wakulla Middle School is committed to success for all students, teachers, staff and our school system.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wakulla Middle School is committed to providing a rigorous and appropriate education that results in success 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
Hofheinz, Amanda	Assistant Principal	
Mitchem, Kelly	School Counselor	
Hillmon, Leon	Other	
Anderson, Jennifer	Other	
Jamison, Lesley	Instructional Coach	
Pfeifer, Stacey	Other	
Dissmore, Nicole	Other	
Balkcom, Sara	Other	
Nelson, Simeon	Principal	
Hoover, Charlotte	Other	

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.

Wakulla Middle School involves all stakeholders by establishing a School Advisory Council that involves community members, parents, teachers, school staff, and student government representatives.

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 School Advisory Council will meet quarterly to review progress on meeting the goals set forth within this school improvement plan. The SAC will make determinations on whether the activities implemented are assisting in achieving the goals set forth, if they are not, we will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. Revising the plan includes implementation of different strategies that support the diverse academic levels of our students.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	65%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	41	39	125
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	37	37	107
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	5	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	3	6	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	32	19	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	31	39	101
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	14	18	44
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	39	37	117

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

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	70	56	80	206
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	45	50	147
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	27	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	39	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	37	40	116
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	26	37	106
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	30	39	99

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	55	47	73	175

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	1	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3

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	70	56	80	206
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	45	50	147
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	27	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	39	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	37	40	116
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	26	37	106
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	30	39	99

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	55	47	73	175

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	1	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3

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*	62	58	50	63	62	54
ELA Learning Gains	51	47	48	52	52	54
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35	35	38	49	48	47
Math Achievement*	63	58	54	74	69	58
Math Learning Gains	62	55	58	64	61	57
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51	47	55	64	52	51
Science Achievement*	48	47	49	69	61	51
Social Studies Achievement*	79	76	71	85	80	72
Middle School Acceleration	77			72		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	528
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	37	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	59			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	51			

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	62	51	35	63	62	51	48	79	77			
SWD	27	44	30	32	55	44	30	37				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	57	44	55	62	59	50	71	70			
HSP	59	53		61	61							
MUL	33	41	27	43	48	44		58				
PAC												

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
WHT	65	51	32	66	64	52	50	83	78			
FRL	48	45	31	48	57	46	42	67	75			

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	52	46	30	56	43	42	41	66	61			
SWD	24	29	21	30	36	31	28	42				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	36	27	33	43	59		55				
HSP	36	25		43	33							
MUL	28	39	50	41	32	25	30					
PAC												
WHT	57	49	30	60	44	41	46	68	63			
FRL	39	40	27	44	39	41	31	51	50			

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	63	52	49	74	64	64	69	85	72			
SWD	28	51	47	41	53	51	23	65	58			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	31	40	56	64	75	69	58	75			
HSP	53	50		56	63							
MUL	63	54		75	56			75	70			
PAC												
WHT	66	54	49	77	65	60	70	87	73			
FRL	53	50	42	66	67	60	63	82	65			

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	49%	53%	-4%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	64%	-4%	47%	13%
06	2023 - Spring	50%	56%	-6%	47%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	68%	70%	-2%	54%	14%
07	2023 - Spring	70%	64%	6%	48%	22%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	53%	-11%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	47%	45%	2%	44%	3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	53%	38%	50%	41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	62%	24%	48%	38%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	71%	2%	66%	7%

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.

Our lowest performing group was the 8th grade science achievement. A contributing factor could be our lowest quartile readers who have difficulty with the complex text associated with science.

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

There were two areas with equal amounts of decline: ELA achievement and Social Studies achievement, both of which declined by 6%. During the 2022-2023 school year, we had five teachers leave the school mid-year. Four of these teachers were ELA teachers, one math/science teacher, and one Civics teacher.

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.

Our 7th grade mathematics scores component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state averaged 48% and Wakulla Middle School students averaged 70% proficient. Our two 7th grade mathematics teachers' instruction was high quality within the classrooms, and had high collective efficacy within their classroom culture.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was mathematics achievement. This component increased by 8% this year. We added all level 3 students to algebra in 8th grade, and had small class sizes to reach more students individually.

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

Two potential areas of concern are the ELA bottom quartile students, as well as, science achievement.

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

ELA bottom quartile learning gains, science achievement, and social studies achievement.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Positive culture and environment are directly linked to student achievement. If the teachers have collective efficacy about our student's performance, our students are more likely to achieve higher.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Implementing a school-wide positive behavioral system will decrease referrals by 5% and increase overall student achievement by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored quarterly by referral data in FOCUS, and progress monitoring data through FAST and STAR.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Hofheinz (amanda.hofheinz@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.)

Wakulla Bucks (economy system) is being implemented for this area of focus. Students will receive "Wakulla Bucks" for positive behavior noticed by teachers and staff and trade the bucks for items in the school store during each grade level team time. Wakulla Middle School also implements Restorative Practice circles weekly within the content area classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teaching students to use an economy system will help with an overall understanding of economics and real-world situations. This will also focus on the positive within the school setting and highlight all the good things students are doing. With a focus on the positive and restorative practices, students are more likely to want to gain access to the items in the school store and show positive behaviors.

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.

Implement system with teachers to ensure that all are aware of how the system works

Person Responsible: Leon Hillmon (leon.hillmon@wcsb.us)

By When: Pre-planning

Prepare Wakulla Bucks for distribution and teach students about economy system

Person Responsible: Leon Hillmon (leon.hillmon@wcsb.us)

By When: August 15

Purchase school store items for student purchase

Person Responsible: Leon Hillmon (leon.hillmon@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing

Restorative Practice circle forms completed by teachers

Person Responsible: Leon Hillmon (leon.hillmon@wcsb.us)

By When: Weekly ongoing

Teachers hand out Wakulla Bucks per the following requirements: completing assignments, showing engagement, demonstrating resiliency, good citizenship, promoting positive influence on peers.

Person Responsible: Leon Hillmon (leon.hillmon@wcsb.us)

By When: Daily

Students will purchase items of choice from the PBIS store - fidgets, chips, cookies, soda, juice, pencils, etc. as advertised on morning announcements daily and posted on posters around the campus.

Person Responsible: Leon Hillmon (leon.hillmon@wcsb.us)

By When: During Team Times for the grade levels - every two weeks

Professional Learning in restorative practices quarterly at faculty meetings. Incorporating role-playing exercises and simulations during training sessions to allow teachers to practice restorative conversations and conflict resolution techniques in a safe and controlled setting.

Person Responsible: Leon Hillmon (leon.hillmon@wcsb.us)

By When: Quarterly

Feedback cycle with teachers - help to identify areas for improvement and provide opportunities for additional training or coaching tailored to specific needs, and ensuring effective implementation of restorative practices

Person Responsible: Leon Hillmon (leon.hillmon@wcsb.us)

By When: Quarterly

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Our students with disabilities are performing at 37% proficient as measured by the Federal Percent of Points Index, which is below the expected percentage of 41% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our students with disabilities will perform at 41% proficient average of all areas of achievement by the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Progress Monitoring using STAR, FAST ELA and Mathematics, and district-based progress monitoring assessments in other tested content areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Hofheinz (amanda.hofheinz@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.)

Wakulla Middle School will be utilizing Professional Learning Communities and completing a book study within the PLC groups to learn how to implement differentiation within their classrooms. Content area PLCs will be meeting weekly to discuss the strategies to be implemented in their classrooms as well as tracking and analyzing data related to their SWD subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLCs are an evidence-based practice that have been proven to increase student achievement across schools. Utilizing the differentiation book study will assist our teachers in understanding how to meet students where they are at and how to meet the needs of diverse learners.

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 PLC groups based on content areas

Person Responsible: Amanda Hofheinz (amanda.hofheinz@wcsb.us)

By When: Pre-planning

PLC groups meet weekly to discuss book study and implement strategies within classrooms to support students with disabilities and lowest quartile students

Person Responsible: Amanda Hofheinz (amanda.hofheinz@wcsb.us)

By When: Weekly

Administrative Walkthroughs to ensure implementation with debrief of administrative team to discuss feedback for teachers

Person Responsible: Simeon Nelson (simeon.nelson@wcsb.us)

By When: Weekly

Monthly Teacher Coach meetings - discuss strategies being implemented within each content area. Check-in on how PLC groups are implementing said strategies and analyze data of DSBA's and unit assessments to determine progress made by students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Amanda Hofheinz (amanda.hofheinz@wcsb.us)

By When: Ongoing each month

Teachers will have Quarterly Data Chats with Administration to review lower quartile students and students with disabilities and their academic progress

Person Responsible: Amanda Hofheinz (amanda.hofheinz@wcsb.us)

By When: Quarterly - documented in school calendar.

Annual IEP meetings with students and IEP team to review accommodations, needs and goals for students with quarterly progress reports by general education and ESE teachers

Person Responsible: Kelly Mitchem (kelly.mitchem@wcsb.us)

By When: Quarterly

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).

The SAC reviewed academic, behavioral and attendance data and determined areas of needed improvement for the current school year. School improvement funding allocations will be reviewed by the school leadership team and SAC and will target areas of need as determined by the comprehensive needs assessment.