Orange County Public Schools

Wetherbee Elementary

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 3

School Information 4

Needs Assessment 6

Planning for Improvement 9

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 0

Wetherbee Elementary

701 E WETHERBEE RD, Orlando, FL 32824

https://wetherbeees.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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission is to lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is 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
Logue, Kristy	Principal
Nelson, Martha	Assistant Principal
Harpe, LaJuana	Instructional Coach
Gelabert, Griselle	Instructional Coach
Alma, Lizette	Instructional Coach
Brown , Shanesa	Other
Jarrell, Carla	School Counselor

Duties

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

The Principal (Kristy Logue): Sets the vision, mission and expectations for the school; Oversees digital implementation, provides supervision of all instruction and accelerates the momentum by setting high expectations for the use and success of the MTSS process. She ensures the
baseline outlook for the development of MTSS and the successful implementation of the process. The principal also ensures support and documentation to increase academic/behavior instruction at the various
tiers. In addition, the principal examines MTSS plans and activities with parents and stakeholders.

The Assistant Principal (Marth Nelson): Provides support and documentation to determine appropriate level of instruction and intensity at all tiered levels. Attends individual student meetings as needed. Supports teachers and adapts priorities, as needed.

The Math Coach (LaJuana Harpe): Provides guidance on K-5 math plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring and assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans.

The Reading Coach (Griselle Gelabert): Provides guidance on K-2 reading plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports

tiered intervention plans.

The Reading Coach (Lizette Alma): Provides guidance on 3-5 reading plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans. Assists in determining appropriate intervention and progress monitoring materials. Keeps an inventory of core curriculum and intervention materials. Coordinates all testing for the school.

The Staffing Specialist (Shanesa Brown): Schedules meetings for ESE students receiving additional support through MTSS, invites participants, ensures coverage for teachers (as needed), conducts and maintains focus of the meeting, sets and monitors time limits, schedules follow-up meetings and invites participants to follow-up meeting(s). Also, she provides guidance on ESE strategies, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, and works with LY students.

The Guidance Counselor (Carla Jarrell): Provides services to students on social and emotional goals and conducts group and individual counseling sessions to assist students. Also, completes assessments and test as needed, analyze results and provides appropriate plans for students.

The Curriculum Teacher (Lymarie Felix): Schedules meetings for ELL students receiving additional support, invites participants, ensures coverage for teachers (as needed), conducts and maintains focus of the meeting, sets and monitors time limits, schedules follow-up meetings and invites participants to follow-up meeting(s). Also, provides guidance on ELL strategies, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, and works with LY students. Oversees the MTSS process.

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	18	20	13	23	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	7	12	4	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	41	46	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	3	1	11	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	2	0	4	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 7/11/2018

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	21	16	16	19	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	4	2	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	41	58	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174

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	1	1	4	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	21	16	16	19	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	4	2	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	41	58	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174

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	1	1	4	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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?

Math lowest 25% learning gains performed at the lowest of all the data components at 46%. Data from the past three years shows this is not a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math learning gains for the lowest 25% showed the greatest declined from 61% to 46%. This was a 15% decrease from the 2016-2017 school year.

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

The biggest gap when compared to the state average is ELA achievement. Wetherbee Elementary scored 62% in ELA achievement and the state scored 56% which is a 6% percent difference.

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

ELA Learning Gains for the lowest 25% showed the most improvement, by increasing 6%. Data from the past three years shows this is not a trend.

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

Teachers were provided professional development to review literacy initiatives and effectively implement strategies within reading lesson plans and instruction. Differentiated small group instruction was provided to all students during the reading block and implements strategic reading intervention based on assessment data.

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	62%	56%	56%	62%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	55%	55%	63%	52%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	48%	49%	42%	46%
Math Achievement	67%	63%	62%	69%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%	57%	59%	73%	54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	46%	47%	60%	41%	46%
Science Achievement	54%	55%	55%	50%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	18 (21)	20 (16)	13 (16)	23 (19)	19 (15)	17 (18)	110 (105)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	3 (3)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (1)	7 (5)	12 (4)	4 (2)	4 (3)	11 (10)	40 (25)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	41 (41)	46 (58)	37 (75)	124 (174)

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**
03	2018	64%	55%	9%	57%	7%
	2017	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	56%	54%	2%	56%	0%
	2017	58%	57%	1%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2018	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%
	2017	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2018	65%	61%	4%	62%	3%
	2017	70%	63%	7%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
	2017	68%	64%	4%	64%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2018	63%	59%	4%	61%	2%
	2017	66%	56%	10%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2018	54%	53%	1%	55%	-1%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

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	11	42	40	17	48	48	11				
ELL	47	56	56	54	55	56	34				

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**
ASN	79	68		89	79		73				
BLK	51	47	57	64	63	42	45				
HSP	63	59	51	65	56	46	53				
WHT	69	68		74	68		67				
FRL	62	59	51	67	59	46	54				

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	7	26	27	20	40	38	18				
ELL	37	43	44	57	62	53	33				
ASN	78	61		81	89						
BLK	62	60	60	73	71	75	65				
HSP	58	52	39	70	67	56	59				
WHT	73	62		76	69		81				
FRL	61	56	45	71	69	61	62				

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	Standards Based Instruction
Rationale	In order for students to be proficient, they must be instructed by teachers who have an understanding of the standards and how to optimally deliver them to the full intent of the standard.
Intended Outcome	To improve the delivery and monitoring of standards based instruction in order to increase student achievement.
Point Person	Kristy Logue (kristy.logue@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	Structured collaborative planning time will be implemented to deconstruct standards and to determine the most effective delivery strategies. Biweekly data meetings will be held to discuss standard based assessment data to help teachers use data to make instructional decisions.
Person Responsible	Kristy Logue (kristy.logue@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Administrators and coaches will attend weekly collaborative planning meetings to support teachers deconstructing standards and developing lesson plans. Data will be collected from standard based assessments and analyzed during biweekly data meetings. Each teacher will have a detailed spreadsheet for recording their class data that will accessible to the leadership team.
Person Responsible	Kristy Logue (kristy.logue@ocps.net)

Activity #2	
Title	DPLC-Close Reading Strategies
Rationale	The district initiative is to incorporate close reading strategies into daily lesson plans to ensure all students are being exposed to close reading strategies using complex text.
Intended Outcome	Teacher's knowledge of researched based close reading strategies will increased based on the training provided by the district and school. Student achievement will be positively impacted by the implementation of researched based strategies incorporated into daily lesson plans.
Point Person	Lizette Alma (lizette.alma@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	The school-based DPLC team will attend District Professional Learning Community meetings held by the district. Teachers will participate in monthly professional development on research based close reading strategies across content areas. Teachers will attend weekly planning meetings to collaborate as a grade level and share effective close reading strategies across content areas.
Person Responsible	Kristy Logue (kristy.logue@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Instructional coaches will attend all planning meetings and provide guidance. Instructional coaches will monitor lesson plans and provide specific feedback. Biweekly data meetings will be held to discuss student achievement and the implementation of close reading strategies.
Person Responsible	Kristy Logue (kristy.logue@ocps.net)