

Wakulla County Schools

Riversink Elementary 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	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Riversink Elementary School

530 LONNIE RAKER LN, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://res.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.

The mission of Riversink Elementary School is to facilitate the development of all students to their fullest potential by providing research-based instructional strategies and promoting the love of learning and community pride in a safe, positive environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will reach his or her highest potential in our positive learning environment provided by highly qualified professionals; every child, every chance, every day.

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
Dotson-Scarry, Bobbie	SAC Member	SAC Leader
Vernon, James	Assistant Principal	Works specifically with Title one and ESE students.
Salib, Bonita	School Counselor	Oversight of ESE, Mental Health and RTI
Hatfield, Heather	Instructional Coach	Works with grade levels on standards, coaching, instructional strategies. Involved in RTI.
Cutchen, Catherine	Principal	Oversight of the day to day operation of the school.

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.

The Riversink SAC committee meet a minimum of four times a year to review the SIP and appropriate data. A school- wide Title 1 Night is held to inform all stakeholders of the process for SIP development.

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))

PLC's are held weekly between teachers and teacher coaches. Heather Hatfield will meet with teams bi-monthly to review data. Mr. Myhre will conduct data chats with grade levels quarterly. Based on these findings, the SIP will be updated and amended to meet the needs of our students.

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	68%
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	21	18	13	23	11	13	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	6	3	5	1	1	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	6	5	8	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	11	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	3	9	5	3	0	0	0	20

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	2	4	2	7	7	9	0	0	0	31

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	1	9	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	25	30	21	9	17	19	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	6	2	3	4	8	10	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	6	4	2	5	3	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	5	4	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	7	7	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	10	10	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	3	7	6	10	9	10	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	13	13	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	25	30	21	9	17	19	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	6	2	3	4	8	10	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	6	4	2	5	3	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	5	4	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	7	7	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	10	10	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	3	7	6	10	9	10	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	13	13	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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*	75	63	56	69	68	57
ELA Learning Gains	68	61	61	55	59	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58	51	52	46	47	53
Math Achievement*	74	68	60	67	68	63
Math Learning Gains	71	69	64	63	69	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68	61	55	50	52	51
Science Achievement*	71	69	51	54	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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	61			

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	75	68	58	74	71	68	71					
SWD	32	38	33	35	58	61	29					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58	54		63	69		50					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	78	69	59	77	73	69	74					
FRL	66	67	63	62	67	53	52					

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	69	50	46	67	56	36	50					
SWD	32	54		25	42		31					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47			53								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	49	40	67	54	42	51					
FRL	61	42		51	39		40					

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	69	55	46	67	63	50	54					
SWD	45	43	35	50	50	43	8					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	60			50								
HSP	50											
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71	58	45	68	65	55	53					
FRL	62	52	42	59	62	46	45					

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	74%	59%	15%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	61%	5%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	50%	25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	61%	12%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	59%	6%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	64%	3%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	57%	9%	51%	15%

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.

Based on the data, students in 2nd grade performed at 66% proficiency in both ELA and Math. Referrals increased by 62 referrals. In those referrals, we had 22 SESIR reports.

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

In second grade, we had a teacher resign at Winter break. We were unable to replace that teacher until April. Eleven students from that classroom are performing below expectation. Our second grade team also struggled with teaching the standards due to lack of resources.

Riversink acquired a new unit last year of students with disabilities. This program accounted for an increase in referrals. In addition, the new house program was not implemented with fidelity.

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.

On PM1, students in third grade performed two points below the district in proficiency and three points below the state. This trend was expected based on the STAR data from the previous year. Lack of appropriate and rigorous instruction contributed to the gap.

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

Data shows the most improvement in our 4th grade ELA co-hort. Last year they had proficiency of 75%. During PM 1, they are already at 41% proficient prior to significant instruction. Action steps included close monitoring of data and identification of students below basic.

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

Attendance is the largest area of concern, with 19% of students missing more than 10% of the school days.

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

3rd grade proficiency in both ELA and Math
Decrease in referrals school-wide.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Students in second grade performed at a level of 66% in both ELA and Math during the May PM3 2023 window. Thus, intervention needs to be implemented to increase proficiency in this cohort of students that are now in 3rd grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Third grade students will increase their reading proficiency from 66% in 2nd grade to 72% in 3rd grade based on the third PM FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

- *PM 1, PM 2 and PM 3 FAST assessment
- *I-ready diagnostic and standard mastery performance
- *STAR data
- *DPM assessments
- *ORF assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@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.)

- *Implementation of I-ready for students in grades 2-5
- *Mentor training for new teachers
- *Implementation of UFLI for Tier II and Tier III students in small group
- *Weekly PLC meetings by grade-level to review rigor, relevance, and resiliency
- *Data Wall review by teacher coaches
- *Monthly Kagan structure implementation and demonstration
- *UFLI training
- *Wonders training
- *Twice monthly meetings with district instructional coach

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The continued development of best practices through the support of district-level Instructional Coaches. Providing data analysis and subgroup identification from the Administrator of Instructional Data. The continued use of RTI identification and monitorization for students in need of additional support based on quantifiable data collected through the RTI process. All strategies are district approved/adopted as evidenced-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.

1. Use of instructional coaches for professional development with Kagan, Wonders, I-Ready, RTI, UFLI, Heggerty, Data Driven Instruction.

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

By When: Twice a week grade-level meetings for professional development by instructional coaches.

2. Use of teacher coaches for professional development with Kagan, Wonders, I-Ready, RTI, UFLI, Heggerty, Data Driven Instruction.

Person Responsible: Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

By When: Monthly professional development by teacher coaches during faculty meetings.

3. Use of Administrator of Instructional Data for analysis.

Person Responsible: James Vernon (james.vernon@wcsb.us)

By When: Monthly grade-level meetings with administration to analyze data.

4. Use of PLC and DCT teams.

Person Responsible: Amy Gaylord (amy.gaylord@wcsb.us)

By When: Pre-planning curriculum development and identification of professional development needs by PLC and DCT teams.

5. Attend UFLI training and implement in grades 1-3, Tier II and III.

Person Responsible: Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

By When: End of first semester.

6. Implementation of i-Ready with usage of 45-60 minutes per week.

Person Responsible: Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

By When: Monthly grade-level meetings with administration to analyze data.

7. Implementation of Wonders reading curriculum.

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

By When: Twice monthly meetings with district instructional coach to assist with areas of need.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Students in second grade performed at a level of 66% in Math and ELA during the May PM 2023 window. Thus, intervention needs to be implemented to increase proficiency in this cohort of students that are now in 3rd grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

3rd grade students will increase their math proficiency from 66% in 2nd grade to 72% in 3rd grade as measured by the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

- *PM 1, PM 2 and PM 3 FAST assessment
- *I-ready diagnostic and standard mastery performance
- *STAR data
- *Use of High Yield Routines
- *Intensive math instruction identified by lowest quartile

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Hatfield (heather.hatfield@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.)

- *Implementation of I-ready for students in grades 2-5
- *Mentor training for new teachers
- *Weekly PLC meetings by grade level to review rigor, relevance, and resiliency
- *Data Wall review by teacher coaches
- *Monthly Kagan structure implementation and demonstration
- *Twice monthly meetings with district instructional coach
- *Use of High Yield Routines

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The continued development of best practices through the support of district level Instructional Coaches. Providing data analysis and subgroup identification from Administrator of Instructional Data. Continued implementation of high yield routines school wide for the support of student achievement. The continued use of RTI identification and monitorization for students in need of additional support based on quantifiable data collected through the RTI process. All strategies are district approved/adopted as evidenced-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.

1. Use of instructional coaches for professional development with Kagan, Big Ideas Math, I-Ready, RTI, Reflex, Data Driven Instruction.

Person Responsible: Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

By When: End of 3rd 9 weeks.

2. Implementation of i-Ready with usage of 45-60 minutes per week.

Person Responsible: Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

By When: Monthly grade level meetings to monitor data.

3. Use of iReady math, High Yield Routines, and Kagan to reinforce standards mastery.

Person Responsible: Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

By When: End of each quarter.

#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.

During the 2022-2023 school year discipline referrals increased by 62 referrals.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Riversink referrals will decrease by 10% through the increased usage of our school PBS plan and as measured by FOCUS referral reports.

Monitoring:

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

Documentation through FOCUS with referral tracking and the number of days assigned for discipline being tracked and recorded through administration. Data tracking through the RTI process. Collaboration with district RTI administrator to track data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Vernon (james.vernon@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.)

- *The use of the House System to promote positive school behavior, individualized character development and improved attendance/school activity participation.
- *The Cloud 9 Resiliency training
- *Monique Burr training
- *SAVE Program
- *CTE Cyber Safety in grades 4 and 5

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In 2022-2023 our PBS program was introduced to faculty and students. This school year increased use with fidelity in giving positive house points be implemented. Increased supervision and involvement by our Assistant Principal in our self contained classrooms.

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.

1. Monthly House meetings

Person Responsible: Bonita Salib (bonita.salib@wcsb.us)

By When: School-wide house meetings scheduled monthly

2. Focusing on character development through the use of the House point system.

Person Responsible: Sarah Watters (sarah.watters@wcsb.us)

By When: Introduction of a new character focus during the monthly meetings.

3. Positive identification of "Housemates" through use of team colors and house meetings.

Person Responsible: Sarah Watters (sarah.watters@wcsb.us)

By When: Monthly team unity challenges.

4. Opportunities for community service and educational enrichment through House team events

Person Responsible: Bonita Salib (bonita.salib@wcsb.us)

By When: Monthly community outreach

5. Education of community stakeholders of the House system to promote buy-in to the program for sustainability.

Person Responsible: Bobbie Dotson-Scarry (bobbie.dotson-scarry@wcsb.us)

By When: Quarterly SAC meetings with stakeholders to update on progress.

#4. -- 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.

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

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/specialprogramsassessment/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/slxsepxqcuuvccqgqg/2324WCSDTitleIBrochure6.pdf>

Annual Title I Presentation for Parents and Families -<https://www.wakullaschooldistrict.org/departments/special-programs-assessment/special-programs-and-assessment-menu/title-1>

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 1

Area of Focus 2

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.