Medart Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Medart Elementary School

2558 COASTAL HWY, Crawfordville, FL 32327

https://mes.wakullaschooldistrict.org/

Demographics

Principal: Stanley Ward

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (44%) 2020-21: (38%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Wakulla County School Board on 11/14/2022.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Medart Elementary School, our purpose is to empower all students to reach their full potential through perseverance and self-motivation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The core value of our school is to provide a rigorous and appropriate education that will result in success for all students. We are committed to creating an environment where all students are appreciated, supported and feel safe to achieve their potential in all areas.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Lawhon, Michele	Teacher, K-12		Teacher coach, 5th grade teacher, wellness coach
Allen, Amber	Dean		Gather and present data at School Advisory council meetings, monitor goals, provided teacher support.
Martin, Jodie	Teacher, ESE		School Advisory Chair, ESE coordinator, Teacher coach, Literacy Team Member
Nelson , Karla	Teacher, K-12		Teacher coach, Mentor, Kindergarten Team leader, Literacy Team Member
Smith, Shari	Teacher, K-12		Teacher coach, Mentor, Literacy team member
Tillman, Susan	Reading Coach		Instructional Coach
Mardis, Bailee	Teacher, K-12		Mentor, Teacher Coach, Literacy Team Member
Ward, Stan	Principal		Oversee all employees, School Safety, Discipline, Data, Observations,
Swain, Angela	Teacher, ESE		Literacy team member, Teacher Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Stanley Ward

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

419

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	73	64	50	69	64	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	383
Attendance below 90 percent	33	26	22	35	32	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	8	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	5	5	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	4	4	27	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	7	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/12/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	64	48	62	62	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Attendance below 90 percent	13	16	7	24	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	6	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	30	42	19	27	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	1	3	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	64	48	62	62	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Attendance below 90 percent	13	16	7	24	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	6	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	30	42	19	27	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	1	3	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	63%	56%	62%			58%	68%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	61%	61%	48%			55%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	51%	52%	7%			45%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	48%	68%	60%	58%			60%	68%	63%
Math Learning Gains	42%	69%	64%	25%			54%	69%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	61%	55%	20%			29%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	69%	51%	49%			48%	56%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	58%	67%	-9%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	66%	-13%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	61%	-1%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	64%	5%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	71%	-15%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	49%	53%	-4%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	21	24	27	18	25	15	25				
BLK	30			10							
MUL	38			54							
WHT	57	41	35	50	42	32	56				
FRL	49	44	37	41	36	37	46				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	21	14		28	36		23				
MUL	50			27							
WHT	67	54		64	30	30	57				
FRL	48	35	8	51	32	25	34				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	36	55	60	42	38	14	24				
BLK	27			20							
MUL	60	73		47	55						
WHT	60	56	47	65	57	34	51				
FRL	49	57	45	49	46	26	41				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The data trends show that we have decreased in ELA since last year at all grade levels except 5th, which showed a 3% increase.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

With the decreases in 3rd and 4th grade, it is evident that both ELA and Math demonstrate a need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

There were multiple contributing factors for the need for improvement. One area that contributed to the decrease in proficiency is attendance, 47% of students were chronically absent 17 or more days. Parent participation is also a factor. We had 5 parent responses to the school survey last year. Another factor is the large number of students in the Response to Intervention process. This number shows that we need to improve our Systemic and Explicit instruction both whole group and small group. We need to find new ways to engage students and to communicate with parents.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Fifth grades Science increased from 48% proficient to 54%. This is a 6% increase and the percent of proficient students is above the state average.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Contributing factors to this improvement were increased science labs, District Standards-Based Assessments, "Mystery Science" and virtual science lessons, "Science on the Move."

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

To accelerate learning teachers need to participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that focus on lesson planning that is standards-based and includes Explicit and Systematic instruction that engages learners through Cooperative Learning Strategies (Kagan). Attendance needs to be a focus, along with parent participation to ensure that we work together as a team to reflect the importance of education. Restorative Disciple and Circle Time (Rufus Lott Restorative Discipline) also needs to be implemented so that all students feel valued and part of the school community.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

All teachers will receive Rufus Lott Restorative Disciple training. Teacher Coaches and the Kagan Coach will be trained in Kagan Strategies which they will then train teachers throughout the school year during PLCs. Teacher Coaches will support teachers and train teachers to use Explicit and Systematic instruction during faculty meetings and during common planning meetings.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Avid tutors and a Reading tutor will be used to remediate students identified by the teachers as needing extra assistance. Science fieldtrips for more hands on experiences. Weekly science labs will be implemented. Parent and Community nights to increase parent involvement. Teacher Coaches will participate as members of the Literacy Team to ensure teachers are using best practices and monitor for fidelity. Data will drive instruction and will be reviewed at Data Team meetings.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities 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 critical need from the data reviewed.	53% of 3rd through 5th grade students scored a level three or higher on the FSA ELA test in 2022.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Using FAST data for ELA, 56% of students, Grades 3-5, will score Level 3 or higher on PM3.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	State FAST data will be used to monitor this goal, three times a year. We will also monitor progress through STAR Reading, District Standards-Based Assessments, and the Response to Intervention process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	PLC (Professional Learning Communities) Explicit Instruction Systematic Instruction Instructional Coach Supplemental small group and differentiated instruction Kagan Structures Response to Intervention/MTSS Process I-Ready

implemented for this Area of Focus.	Ready Reading Discovery Education Freckle Canvas Learning Rewards Common Boards FCRR activities Journeys AVID strategies Lalilo Teacher Coaches
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The Instructional Coach meets with grade levels to plan instruction, model instruction, monitor curriculum. The use of Common Boards allows the students to know the expectations. Teachers will use the district provided tools and instructional materials to plan standards-based lessons. Data Teams will meet quarterly to identify a watchlist of students that will need extra support. Progress will be monitored using FAST, STAR and District Standards Based Assessments. Best Practices for Inclusion will be considered for creating IEPs, student placement and lesson plans. Kagan Structures will be implemented to engage learners. Through PLC teachers will plan standard based lesson that are Systematic and will use Explicit instruction that provides scaffolding and differentiation to align with the B.E.S.T. ELA benchmarks. Teacher Coaches will hold professional development opportunities at faculty meetings, support teachers and attend grade level PLC. HITS, High Impact Teaching Support program is being used to promote collaboration among schools.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teacher Coaches will support teachers through professional development, modeling, analyzing student data, resources, observations, PLCs, feedback and lesson planning support. Teacher coaches will monitor, offer support, and help maintain and implement common boards in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Karla Nelson (karla.nelson@wcsb.us)

The Instructional Coach will monitor the Watchlist and Response to Intervention process. The Coach will make sure that interventions are done with fidelity.

Person Responsible	Susan Tillman (susan.ptillman@wcsb.us)

Teacher Coaches will support, help plan, through PLCs, and observe that instruction is delivered Systematically and through Explicit instruction methods that provides scaffolding and differentiation to align with the B.E.S.T. ELA benchmarks (strong evidence-based practice according to What Works Clearing House).

Person Responsible	Shari Smith (shari.smith@wscb.us)

Classrooms and lesson plans will be monitored for the use of effective Kagan Strategies.

Person Responsible	Jodie Martin (jodie.martin@wcsb.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	47.9% of 3rd through 5th grade students were proficient on the 2022 Math FSA.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	51% of students, grades 3-5, will test proficient on the 2023 PM3 FAST Math test.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This will be monitored through the State FAST progress monitoring data, STAR Math, and District Standards Based Assessments, and Response to Intervention data will be monitor to ensure progress toward the end goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	Instructional Coach Supplemental Small Group and Differentiated Instruction Kagan Structures Response to Intervention I-ready Math Discovery Education Freckles Canvas Learning

implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher Coaches High Yield Routines Common Boards PLC (Professional Learning Communities) Explicit Instruction Systematic Instruction Cengage & Big Ideas (adapted text)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The Instructional Coach is meeting with grade levels to plan instruction and to model instruction for ELA. Instructional Coaches also support in monitoring curriculum and monitoring the fidelity of the Response to Intervention process. The use of Common Boards allows the students to know the expectations. Teachers will use the district provided tools and instructional materials to plan standards-based lessons. Data Teams will meet quarterly to identify a watchlist of students that will need extra support. Progress will be monitored using FAST, STAR and District Standards Based Assessments. Best Practices for Inclusion will be considered for creating IEPs and lesson plans. Kagan Structures will be implemented to engage learners. Through PLC teachers will plan standard based lesson that are systematic and will use Explicit instruction. Teacher Coaches will hold professional development opportunities at faculty meetings and attend grade level PLC. High Yield Routines will be used daily.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teacher Coaches support teachers through professional development, modeling, student data, resources, observations, PLC, feedback and lesson planning support. Teacher coaches will monitor, offer support and help maintaining common boards, including the implementation of common boards in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Michele Lawhon (michele.lawhon@wcsb.us)

The Instructional Coach will monitor Watchlist and Response to Intervention. The coach will make sure that interventions are done with fidelity.

Person Responsible	Susan Tillman (susan.ptillman@wcsb.us)

Teacher Coaches will support, help plan through PLC and observe that instruction is delivered systematically and through Explicit instruction methods, which includes High Yield Routines.

Person Responsible	Bailee Mardis (bailee.mardis@wcsb.us)

Classrooms and lessons plans will be monitored for the use of Kagan structures to insure that student engagement is high.

Person Responsible	Jodie Martin (jodie.martin@wcsb.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	20% of the Black/African American population at Medart scored proficient on the 2022 FSA .
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	41% of Black/African American Students will score proficient on the FAST Test.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This will be monitored through the State FAST Data. STAR, and District Based Assessments, and Response to Intervention data will be monitor to ensure progress toward the end goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stan Ward (stanley.ward@wcsb.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	PLC (Professional Learning Communities) Explicit Instruction Systematic Instruction Instructional Coach Supplemental small group and differentiated instruction Kagan Structures Response to Intervention/MTSS Process I-Ready

	Ready Reading Discovery Education Freckle Canvas Learning Rewards Common Boards AVID strategies Teacher Coaches Pebble Go Mystery Science Avid Tutors On the Job Training Students Journeys Cengage & Big Ideas

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Teachers will identify students through the student data base, "Focus". Instructional Coaches will meet with and support monitoring curriculum and the fidelity of the Response to Intervention process. The use of Common Boards allows the students to know the expectations. Teachers will use the district provided tools and instructional materials to plan standards-based lessons. Data Teams will meet quarterly to identify a watchlist of students that will need extra support. Progress will be monitored using FAST, STAR and District Standards Based Assessments. Best Practices for Inclusion will be considered for creating IEPs and lesson plans. Kagan Structures will be implemented to engage learners. Through PLC teachers will plan standard based lesson that are systematic and will use Explicit instruction. Teacher Coaches will hold professional development opportunities at faculty meetings and attend grade level PLC.

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.

State data will be used to monitor this goal, three times a year. We will also monitor progress through STAR Reading, District Based assessment, and Response to Intervention.

Person Responsible	Stan Ward (stanley.ward@wcsb.us)

The Instructional Coach will monitor Watchlist and Response to Intervention. The coach will make sure that interventions are done with fidelity. Also monitored will be the use of the appropriate instructional materials provided such as, I-Ready, Ready Reading, Discovery Education, Freckle, Reward, Pebble Go, Journeys, and
Cengage & Big Ideas.

Person Responsible	Susan Tillman (susan.ptillman@wcsb.us)

Classrooms and lessons plans will be monitored for the use of Kagan structures to insure that student engagement is high.

Person Responsible	Jodie Martin (jodie.martin@wcsb.us)

#4. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.	22% of Students with Disabilities were proficient on the 2022 FSA.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	41% of Students with Disabilities will be proficient on the 2023 PM3 FAST.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	State data will be used to monitor this goal, three times a year. We will also monitor progress through STAR Reading, District Standards-Based Assessments and Response to Intervention process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jodie Martin (jodie.martin@wcsb.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	PLC Explicit Instruction Systematic Instruction Instructional Coach Supplemental small group and differentiated instruction Kagan Structures Response to Intervention/MTSS Process I-Ready

	Ready Reading Discovery Education Freckle Canvas Learning Rewards
implemented for this Area of Focus.	Common Boards FCRR activities Journeys AVID strategies Lailo Teacher Coaches Pebble Go Learning Ally
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students with Disabilities will be identified through IEP meetings, the student data base, collaborative meetings with the teacher of students with disabilities, They will be taught in the least restrictive environment. Teachers will use Explicit and Systematic Instruction, along with Kagan strategies for engagement. Systematic and explicit instruction that provides scaffolding and differentiation to align with the B.E.S.T. ELA benchmarks (strong evidence-based practice according to What Works Clearing House) Small group remediation will be done by the classroom teacher, ESE teacher and paraprofessional. Student data will be monitored and reviewed. Any student with a disability that has a grade of D or F at the end of the nine weeks will be reported to the ESE Coordinator, who will then schedule a meeting with the IEP Team. The use of accommodations is monitored through Accommodation Logs which are turned in to the ESE Coordinator each Nine Week Grading Period.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teacher Coaches support teachers through professional development, modeling, student data, resources, observations, PLC, feedback and lesson planning support.

Person Responsible	Angela Swain (angela.swain@wcsb.us)

Student data will be monitored and reviewed. Any student with a disability that has a grade of D or F at the end of the nine weeks will be reported to the ESE Coordinator, who will then schedule a meeting with the IEP Team.

Person Responsible	Jodie Martin (jodie.martin@wcsb.us)

Classrooms and lessons plans will be monitored for the use of Kagan structures to insure that student engagement is high.

Person Responsible	Amber Allen (amber.allen@wcsb.us)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, the percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3 who are not on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide ELA assessment is as follows:

Kdg – 29% scored below a Level 3 as indicated on STAR Early Literacy

1st – 40% scored below a Level 3 as indicated on STAR Reading

2nd – 41% scored below a Level 3 as indicated on STAR Reading

Based on the data reviewed, this has been identified as a critical need. The areas for improvement include decoding words, analyzing word parts, recognizing words, and writing.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

On the 2022 statewide standardized assessment, 55% of students in grade 3 did not meet proficiency, scoring below a level 3. Based on the data reviewed, the domain identified as an area of need was Key Ideas and Details. Students must be able to demonstrate these key concepts of reading to develop reading comprehension.

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

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

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

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

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Using STAR data for Early Literacy and Reading, 51% of students in grades K-2 will score a level 3 or higher on the Spring statewide progress monitoring assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Using FAST PM data for ELA, 51% of thirds grade students will score a level 3 or higher on PM3 of the statewide progress monitoring assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Classroom walk-throughs and observations

Weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focused on discussion and implementation of strategic and explicit instruction strategies, ongoing student data, and remediation/intervention to address student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Allen, Amber, amber.allen@wcsb.us

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The following evidence-based practices will be implemented and align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Based Reading Plan. These evidence-based practices are based on recommendations from the IES Practice Guides: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade; Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade; Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades.

-Systematic and explicit instruction that provides scaffolding and differentiation to align with the B.E.S.T. ELA benchmarks (strong evidence-based practice according to What Works Clearing House)
-Teachers will follow a scope and sequence that is carefully thought out, builds on prior learning, moves from simple to complex, and supports comprehension development (strong evidence-based according to What Works Clearing House)
-Teachers will routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of texts (strong evidence-based practice according to What Works Clearing House)

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Systematic and explicit instruction that provides scaffolding and differentiation are necessary to build a knowledge base. Building skills gradually and introducing skills in isolation and then integrating them with other skills provides students practice and builds generalization to ensure understanding and mastery. Repeated and routine use of comprehension-building practices help students make sense of the texts so that they will be able to construct meaning. Comprehension strategies help readers enhance their understanding, overcome difficulties in comprehending, and compensate for weak background knowledge. These practices have been proven to be effective for the target population.

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership: School Level Literacy Leadership team will meet monthly to discuss and review literacy data and instructional strategies. Literacy Coaching: . Instructional Coach will attend Literacy Leadership team meetings, RTI meetings, Coteach in the classroom, support teachers with planning, provide instructional resources and strategies. Assessment: FAST and STAR will be used to monitor the progress and outcomes of literacy goals and focus areas.. Professional Learning Weekly PLC meetings will be held to review and support instructional strategies used in the classroom.	Tillman, Susan, susan.ptillman@wcsb.us
Literacy Leadership: Literacy Leadership team members will participate monthly in .RAISE Webinars through PAEC. Literacy Coaching: Teacher coaches will be members of the Literacy team, support teacher with planning, strategies, modeling, and resources. Assessment: District Based Assessments and Systematic Instruction Phonics and Phonemic Awareness assessment will be used to monitor focus areas and progress toward goals.	Martin, Jodie, jodie.martin@wcsb.us

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Here at Medart, we have numerous programs that help build trust and high expectations. We currently have a program that sends food and snacks home with over 100 students weekly and have a closet where

students can get clothes, shoes, back packs, school supplies and hygiene needs. Research shows that students need there basic needs met before they can learn. Also at Medart we have a Licensed Clinical Social worker, employed by the district, on campus one day a week to assist students. We also have partnerships with outside counseling services that we can refer students with needs, including an outside agency that hold weekly small group guidance lessons the school.

Our positive behavior system creates a positive learning environment that celebrates and appreciates the differences in everyone using Rufus Lott's Restorative Discipline program. The program teaches students to take responsibility for their choices, be mindful of others, remain mannerly and respectful and be stakeholders in their own learning. Students are honored daily on the Morning announcements for their efforts in being proactive in their education and a good citizen. On top of this, students also attend guidance classes where they learn about bullying, harassment, cyberbullying, friendship, career choice, abuse, and much more. Students participate in Sanford Harmony lessons through SEL class and through Monique Burr Prevention Education programs. When needed, small group and individual guidance is available. There is also an incentive program in place school wide where students earn " Mustang Bucks". This form of currency can be used to buy privileges such as eating lunch with the teacher, being Principal for the day, sitting with a friend, etc.

Student's service can also help provide a check in a program that allows teachers to mentor students with needs. The student checks in with someone else to help the student gain confidence and responsibility. Medart works to ensure that every student has an adult advocate. Students' individual needs and success are our highest priority. FSA data chats will also be used to help students set personal goals with the help of an adult who will encourage personal growth. The school and district's BPIE goals are also monitored to ensure that all students have an equal and appropriate education and that best practices are being used.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Parents are invited and encouraged to attend regularly scheduled School Advisory Council meetings held four times per year. During regularly scheduled SAC meetings, parents and families assist with planning, review, and evaluation of the parent and family engagement plans, including the school improvement plan. Parent input is sought, recognized, valued, and strongly considered in the decision-making process, including decisions involving Title 1 programs and funding. In addition, parental feedback is solicited via the annual school climate
survey, as well as, at each parental involvement activity hosted by the school. Parents of Students with Disabilities are encouraged to be a part of the IEP Team. Parents of Students in Tier II and Tier III are invited to MTSS meetings. The teacher of Music runs extra curricular ORF Band and Choir before School and participate in the Coalition of the Arts. Medart also has an Odyssey of the Mind team which meets afterschool and competes at Districts and possibly State. The Wakulla County Fire and Rescue partners with Medart for Fire Safety Month. They come to the school and present lessons and show the students their gear and truck. We also have Project Learning Tree where many different community members come and teach students about the environment.