

Wakulla County Schools

Wakulla High 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	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Wakulla High School

3237 COASTAL HWY, Crawfordville, FL 32327

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Wakulla County School Board on 11/13/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Wakulla High School is to provide an educational program in a safe environment that contributes to the development of each student emotionally, academically, and physically in order for him or her to successfully function in our continually changing, diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision is that the majority of the students will graduate from Wakulla High School with not just a diploma, but also with the technical knowledge, the academic skills, and the personal qualities needed for future success.

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
Murray, Breonne	SAC Member	
Falk, Michele	Principal	
Harvey, Frankie	Assistant Principal	
Mapes, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Prosser, Kerry	Assistant Principal	

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 High School involves all stakeholders in the school improvement process by establishing a School Advisory Council that is composed school staff, teachers, parents, students and community members. After a review of current schoolwide data in academics, attendance, discipline, etc., the SAC drafts, and later approves, school improvement goals for the year.

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 meets quarterly to review progress on meeting the goals set forth within the 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, the SAC will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. Revising the plan includes implementation of different strategies that support the diverse academic levels and needs of our students.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	21%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
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) 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	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	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	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	0	0	416
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

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	34
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	0	0	0
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	0
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	51	51	52	59	59	56
ELA Learning Gains	49	49	52	50	50	51
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36	36	41	35	35	42
Math Achievement*	51	51	41	52	52	51
Math Learning Gains	67	67	48	54	54	48
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56	56	49	47	47	45
Science Achievement*	66	66	61	82	82	68
Social Studies Achievement*	75	75	68	84	84	73
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate	96			95		
College and Career Acceleration	61			73		
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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	608
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	96

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	47			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	55			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	54			

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	51	49	36	51	67	56	66	75		96	61	
SWD	29	40	23	34	62	50	50	50		94	37	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	39	37	36	60		37	62		100	27	
HSP	41	42		47			64	55		100	39	
MUL	32	38	36	44	73		55	67		100	62	
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	55	51	37	53	66	61	70	77		95	67	
FRL	39	43	34	43	63	48	58	73		94	47	

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	51	44	35	42	34	39	66	72		96	73	
SWD	22	33	29	22	36	37	32	38		96	57	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	49	52	19	31	33	52	56		97	39	
HSP	38	33		33	30		33	79				
MUL	47	45	40	29	30	33	56	64		100	64	
PAC												
WHT	53	45	32	45	34	40	69	75		96	78	
FRL	42	42	38	36	32	30	63	56		97	60	

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	59	50	35	52	54	47	82	84		95	73	
SWD	33	37	22	30	38	31	100	73		93	49	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	45	37	48	58	42	79	68		98	52	
HSP	53	50	36	37			79			100	77	
MUL	63	53		50	50		79	64		94	60	
PAC												
WHT	61	51	33	54	54	48	82	86		95	76	
FRL	49	46	33	45	57	45	76	77		93	64	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	56%	55%	1%	50%	6%
09	2023 - Spring	61%	59%	2%	48%	13%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	50%	-19%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	62%	-4%	48%	10%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	76%	0%	63%	13%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	76%	1%	63%	14%

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.

The lowest performing data component is Algebra I with a proficiency score of 31% in the Spring 2023 administration. Contributing factors include that Algebra I is a heavily tested subject in middle school and students who take Algebra 1 in high school are often in the lowest quartile.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is Geometry. In the Spring 2023 testing the proficiency was 58% which is a decline of 10% from the Spring 2022. Contributing factors include Geometry is a heavily tested subject in middle school and students who take Geometry in high school are often in the lowest quartile.

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.

Algebra I is the data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The difference is -22% from the school-to-state average. Contributing factors include that Algebra I is a heavily tested subject in middle school and students who take Algebra 1 in high school are often in the lowest quartile.

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 Acceleration Success. Contributing factors included scheduling all students into Foundations of Web Design which gave students the opportunity to become certified in Word Press.

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

N/A

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year is math, ela, and discipline referrals.

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.

Increase student proficiency on specific math EOC. This goal is retained again this year as there was a decrease proficiency from 68% to 58% in Geometry and 34% to 31% in Algebra I from 2021-22 to 2022-23. Student identified through ongoing data review as not meeting grade-level mastery will receive targeted interventions according to district's Response to Intervention (RTI) process. The differentiated, targeted instruction will meet individualized student needs to maximize learning and growth. Teacher coaches will increase student achievement by providing teachers with professional development and mentoring they need to become effective teachers. These coaches will provide support for teachers in data analysis, instructional planning, program implementation, and much more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

63% of students will score proficient on their specific EOC.

Monitoring:

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

WHS identifies students in need of tiered intervention through ongoing progress monitoring and provide supports as determined by district's RTI process. WHS utilizes instructional coaches and teacher coaches for instructional support. The following programs are used for progress monitoring and instructional support: STAR Math, Algebra Nation, and Geometry Nation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Mapes (jessica.mapes@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.)

WHS identifies students in need of tiered intervention through ongoing progress monitoring and provide supports as determined by district's RTI process. WHS utilizes instructional coaches and teacher coaches for instructional support. The following programs are used for progress monitoring and instructional support: STAR Math, Algebra Nation, and Geometry Nation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In addition to gauging the process of students through the school year, the STAR Math Assessment can be used to test a student's readiness for state tests. Algebra Nation and Geometry Nation help teachers differentiate and individualize instruction to meet student' needs, speeds, and preferences. Students identified through ongoing date review as not meeting grade-level mastery will receive targeted interventions according to the district's RTI process. This differentiated, targeted instruction will meet individualized student needs to maximize learning and growth.

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.

Professional development is provided to teachers during pre-planning for STAR and the RTI process.

Person Responsible: Kerry Prosser (kerry.prosser@wcsb.us)

By When: Beginning of school and as needed for new hires.

Review of student data to identify needs (statewide assessments, STAR, standards-based assessments, etc)

Person Responsible: Jessica Mapes (jessica.mapes@wcsb.us)

By When: On going

Scheduling of students in appropriate classes based on need. Struggling math students are placed in a two year algebra and/or geometry course sequence. Students not performing at proficiency level are provided additional intensive math support course.

Person Responsible: Kerry Prosser (kerry.prosser@wcsb.us)

By When: Beginning of each school year

Implementation of instructional programs or strategies that are customizable to student needs.

Person Responsible: Kerry Prosser (kerry.prosser@wcsb.us)

By When: On going

#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.

Increase student proficiency in ELA State Testing. Students identified through ongoing data review as not meeting grade-level mastery will receive targeted interventions according to the RTI process. This differentiated, targeted instruction will meet individualized students' needs to maximize learning. Instructional coaches and teacher coaches will increase student achievement by providing teachers with the professional development and mentoring they need to become effective teachers. These coaches will provide support for teachers in data analysis, instructional planning, program implementation, and much more.

Measurable Outcome:

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

63% of students will score proficient on FAST ELA for PM3.

Monitoring:

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

We will utilize the district's progress monitoring calendar to ensure that each student is tested in the appropriate monitoring window. Data will be reviewed to track students growth and likelihood of FAST achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barbie Hartsfield (barbie.hartsfield@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.)

WHS identifies students in need of tiered intervention through ongoing progress monitoring and provide supports as determined by district's RTI process. WHS schedules students in appropriate Intensive Reading class with implementation of required curriculum, Savvas. WHS implements Wakulla Writes, FAST to track mastery of standards, and implementation of intervention as required by the RTI process. WHS utilizes teacher coaches for instructional support. The following programs are used for progress monitoring and instructional support: STAR Reading, Freckle, Perfection Next, and Savvas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In addition to gauging the process of students through the school year, the STAR Reading Assessment can be used to test a student's readiness for state tests. Perfection Next helps teachers differentiate and individualize instruction to meet student' needs, speeds, and preferences. Students identified through ongoing data review as not meeting grade-level mastery will receive targeted interventions according to the district's RTI process. This differentiate, targeted instruction will meet individualized student needs to maximize learning and growth.

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.

Monitor progress of students using STAR and Perfection Next data through quarterly meetings with instructional coach.

Person Responsible: Barbie Hartsfield (barbie.hartsfield@wcsb.us)

By When: Quarterly

Using AVID strategies: Close and Careful Reading, Focused Note Taking, and WICOR Strategies in all ELA classrooms. Teachers coaches will model and provide guidance for ELA teachers as needed during PLC.

Person Responsible: Erin Daughtry (erin.daughtry@wcsb.us)

By When: As needed during PLC.

Professional development is provided to teachers during preplanning for STAR, Savvas, and RTI process.

Person Responsible: Kerry Prosser (kerry.prosser@wcsb.us)

By When: Beginning of school year and as needed for new hires.

Review of students data to identify needs (statewide assessments, STAR, standards-based assessments, etc)

Person Responsible: Jessica Mapes (jessica.mapes@wcsb.us)

By When: On going

Scheduling of students in appropriate Intensive Reading classes based on need.

Person Responsible: Kerry Prosser (kerry.prosser@wcsb.us)

By When: Beginning of school year.

Implementation of Wakulla Writes and FAST to track mastery of standards

Person Responsible: Frankie Harvey (frankie.harvey@wcsb.us)

By When: Quarterly

Implementation of interventions as required by RTI process.

Person Responsible: Barbie Hartsfield (barbie.hartsfield@wcsb.us)

By When: On going

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

In Quarter 1 of the 2023-24SY, there are 9.5% of the students have 1 or more discipline referrals. 89.5 of the students do not have a referral.

Measurable Outcome:

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

85% of our students will remain referral free during the 2023-24SY.

Monitoring:

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

WHS will monitor the number of non-violent disciplinary referrals monthly to identify trends and patterns. WHS identified behaviors of tardiness and failure to follow school rules in the first quarter as a trend to address for students with discipline. WHS discipline along with help from the SOAR council to identify the effectiveness of incentives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Coleman Wells (colemans.wells@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.)

WHS identifies habitual behavior problems by monitoring disciplinary referrals. WHS will utilize the Positive Behavioral Incentive and Support (PBIS) system to target the decrease of discipline referrals in tardiness and failure to follow school rules.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

WHS identifies areas of patterned behavior that impact instructional time and effectiveness. The PBIS model allows behavior to be addressed in individual classrooms and schoolwide. This model is effective in targeting and recognizing positive and appropriate behavior schoolwide.

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.

Identify behavioral patterns that need to be addressed in the school year.

Person Responsible: Coleman Wells (colemans.wells@wcsb.us)

By When: End of first quarter

Identify incentives and requirements to obtain incentives during the school year.

Person Responsible: Victoria Pope (victoria.pope@wcsb.us)

By When: End of first quarter.

Monitor the quantity and types of discipline referrals.

Person Responsible: Coleman Wells (coleman.wells@wcsb.us)

By When: Monthly

Monitoring of incentives effectiveness using data.

Person Responsible: Victoria Pope (victoria.pope@wcsb.us)

By When: Monthly

Identify behavioral patterns that need to be addressed in the school year.

Person Responsible: Coleman Wells (coleman.wells@wcsb.us)

By When: End of first quarter

Identify incentives and requirements to obtain incentives during the school year.

Person Responsible: Victoria Pope (victoria.pope@wcsb.us)

By When: End of first quarter.

Monitor the quantity and types of discipline referrals.

Person Responsible: Coleman Wells (coleman.wells@wcsb.us)

By When: Monthly

Monitoring of incentives effectiveness using data.

Person Responsible: Victoria Pope (victoria.pope@wcsb.us)

By When: Monthly