Wekiva High

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wekiva High

2501 N HIAWASSEE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

https://wekivahs.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	82%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	C	B*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

To lead students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
	Principal
Kispert, George	Assistant Principal
Wilson, Demetria	Assistant Principal
Ellison, Gwendolynn	Instructional Coach
Mindermann, Johnathan	Instructional Coach
Shepherd, Valerie	Instructional Coach
Brown-Griffin, Keshia	Dean
Coffey-Wilson, La'Tanya	Other
Russell, Anthony	Assistant Principal
Rogers, Theresa	Instructional Coach
Young, Rhonda	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The leadership team examines the data from the previous school year and determines appropriate goals for the school improvement plan. Because the leadership team at Wekiva High School is committed to providing the highest quality education for every student, each assistant principal supports specific curriculum areas, and works with the curriculum leaders, PLC team leaders, deans, and instructional coaches to develop an appropriate plan of action to support students. Assistant Principals provide prescriptive feedback to teachers through conducting classroom walk-throughs, informal observations, and formal observations to improve instructional practices that, ultimately impact student achievement. Members of the team also work in conjunction with the School Advisory Council to monitor the progress of the school improvement plan. The deans work closely with teachers in helping to enhance their classroom management skills so that students can meet with optimal success in their classrooms. The instructional coaches support and mentor the teachers in their respective departments. Their work includes model teaching, team teaching, conducting peer observations, researching additional strategies and information to assist teachers, data gathering, facilitating data progress monitoring meetings with PLC team, and celebrating teacher success.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	166	156	150	620
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	121	81	66	405
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316	307	247	140	1010
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	213	30	21	550
07	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	247	142	97	764

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	8	8	12	41

Date this data was collected
Tuesday 7/24/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	163	119	142	591
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	54	36	12	180
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	181	115	29	493
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207	167	0	0	374

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198	180	82	59	519

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	163	119	142	591
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	54	36	12	180
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	181	115	29	493
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207	167	0	0	374

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198	180	82	59	519

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The data component that performed the lowest was in the area of math achievement, specifically algebra. Algebra scores have remained consistent over the past three years: 2016=16%, 2017=14%, 2018=18%. Math performance in our feeder elementary and middle schools has been of concern and a topic of collaboration amongst our schools.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Biology was the component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year. There has not been a consistent trend in the scores, but an irregular pattern of results: 2015=74%, 2016=55%, 2017=65%, and 2018=53%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was in the area of math achievement. Although gains were made in geometry, scores in algebra dropped.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component that showed the most improvement was in math achievement. This was due to the gains made in the area of geometry.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The increase in the area of math achievement (specifically geometry) was precipitated by the increased use of common planning time for the PLC, along with common assessment construction, data review, remediation and enrichment activities based upon data, and taking time to spiral back on previously taught standards.

School Data
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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	54%	56%	33%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	51%	53%	35%	47%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	40%	44%	28%	36%	38%
Math Achievement	31%	49%	51%	25%	40%	43%
Math Learning Gains	30%	44%	48%	44%	51%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	39%	45%	52%	55%	38%
Science Achievement	55%	66%	67%	56%	66%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	69%	71%	63%	67%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	148 (167)	166 (163)	156 (119)	150 (142)	620 (591)
One or more suspensions	137 (78)	121 (54)	81 (36)	66 (12)	405 (180)
Course failure in ELA or Math	316 (168)	307 (181)	247 (115)	140 (29)	1010 (493)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	286 (207)	213 (167)	30 (0)	21 (0)	550 (374)
07	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
0	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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
09	2018	41%	50%	-9%	53%	-12%
	2017	35%	49%	-14%	52%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	38%	49%	-11%	53%	-15%
	2017	39%	47%	-8%	50%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	52%	62%	-10%	65%	-13%
2017	64%	60%	4%	63%	1%
Compare		-12%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	61%	65%	-4%	68%	-7%
2017	57%	64%	-7%	67%	-10%
Compare		4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	18%	61%	-43%	62%	-44%
2017	14%	53%	-39%	60%	-46%
Compare		4%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	38%	65%	-27%	56%	-18%
2017	23%	43%	-20%	53%	-30%
Compare		15%			

Subgroup Data

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	32	29	21	23	18	28	37		73	31
ELL	14	34	38	11	16		33	30		80	33
ASN	53	53		50	40		71	85		100	64
BLK	38	44	38	26	31	32	48	53		90	33
HSP	39	49	34	30	30	35	56	56		89	46
MUL	66	66		47	31		62	78		91	40
WHT	54	54	35	42	28	13	66	74		93	63
FRL	42	48	36	31	30	31	55	61		90	40
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	14	31	29	12	24	29	35	41		75	27
ELL	15	33	28	12	23	28	64	29		62	33
ASN	76	83		38	33		92	80		100	75
BLK	33	42	28	15	23	26	56	54		86	28
HSP	34	41	32	16	22	24	69	58		85	35
MUL	44	52		16	17		67	60		86	42
WHT	52	51	46	24	22	23	83	74		92	63
FRL	39	45	31	18	22	26	67	60		86	39

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	DPLC – District Professional Learning Community
Rationale	All content areas will be asked to take part in the participation of the strategies brought back from teacher leaders that are members of the DPLC. Wekiva will focus on the use of close reading strategies as well as text-dependent questioning to improve student literacy, which in turn will support all content areas. Wekiva students need exposure to complex text. The incorporation of complex text within lessons across all content areas is a necessity.
Intended Outcome	Through the use of complex text and strategies taught as part of the DLPLC initiatives, Wekiva High School will see an increase in student literacy which will assist our students in being college and career ready upon graduation.
Point Person	Michele Erickson (michele.erickson@ocps.net)

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will receive ongoing professional development and training on close read strategies and the use of text-dependent questions, resulting in rigorous oral and written responses from students in all content areas, in accordance with the District Professional Learning Community Plan. 2. Instructional coaches as well as leadership team personnel will provide support with training as well as assist with modeling. 3. DPLC team members will assist the administrative team by working with teachers within content specific PLC groups.
Person Responsible	Michele Erickson (michele.erickson@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. The plan will be monitored by observing the use of the strategies by teachers in individual classrooms, and providing support and guidance where needed. 2. Students will be monitored through various progress monitoring assessments, providing data and indicating growth or need for remediation. 3. Data will be analyzed by content specific PLC teams and the leadership team to ensure all groups are making progress with the use of close read strategies and the use of complex text.
Person Responsible	Michele Erickson (michele.erickson@ocps.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Student Achievement on State Mandated Assessments
Rationale	Wekiva High School's state assessment areas have been inconsistent over the past few years, with some areas showing modest growth, some remaining stagnant, and others falling in performance levels. However, the data indicates that the scores on the assessments are still far below the expected achievement levels. By assisting all teachers with the consistent use of data to guide and differentiate instruction, all students can progress to the intended level of complexity. By presenting standards-based instruction at the level of rigor required and by providing common assessments, PLC groups can create a sense of accountability that will assist students with academic growth.
Intended Outcome	Wekiva High School will see an overall increase of at least 5% in each of the various high-stake achievement assessments through an intense focus on standards-based instruction, collaboration, and monitoring of student progress.
Point Person	Michele Erickson (michele.erickson@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	Administration and instructional coaches will utilize common collaborative planning within content specific PLC groups to produce high quality and rigorous standards-based instruction as well as common assessments in order to facilitate student achievement. Administrators and teachers will review common assessment results and will use data from these assessments to revise instruction in order to meet the needs of students.
Person Responsible	Michele Erickson (michele.erickson@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Student achievement on common assessments as well as Progress Monitoring Activities (PMA's) from the district will be monitored and analyzed for student progress and need for remediation. Assessment results will be analyzed by standards as well as strands to monitor effectiveness. Classroom walk-throughs as well as coaching and evaluative observations will be conducted to verify instruction is standards-based at the appropriate level of rigor, and being taught with fidelity.
Person Responsible	Michele Erickson (michele.erickson@ocps.net)

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$0.00**