Winding Waters K 8

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Winding Waters K 8

12240 VESPA WAY, Weeki Wachee, FL 34614

https://www.hernandoschools.org/wwk8

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)
Combination School PK-8	No	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

The School mission is to encourage and support teachers and community leaders to work together in order to develop an inspiring and rigorous learning environment that supports the needs of all children.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The School vision is to cultivate an environment for students to reach their maximum potential. Students will be empowered to be risk takers and critical thinkers thereby acquiring the skills and confidence necessary to become lifelong learners and responsible citizens in our global society.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Cerro, Janet	Principal
DeArmas, Jennifer	Other
Minichino, Jillian	Assistant Principal
Cooper, Michael	Teacher, K-12
Santiago, Laura	Teacher, K-12
Edwards, Carissa	Teacher, K-12
Mendez, Al	Teacher, K-12
Shumate, Jeff	Teacher, K-12
Ploskonka, Tracie	Teacher, K-12
castoria, lisa	Administrative Support
McDonnell, Caitlyn	Teacher, K-12
Wogan, Kristen	Teacher, K-12
Sather, Theresa	Teacher, K-12
Medina, Debbie	Paraprofessional
Ladd, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12
Fremer, Bobbi	Teacher, K-12
Laushot, Misty	Teacher, K-12
Gleason, Sheryl	Teacher, ESE

Duties

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

The role of our School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to ensure that our school maintains a focus on learning and continuous improvement. Our SBLT meets every two weeks and reviews student progress, the team makes recommendations when data indicates there may be a need to adjust

instruction in order to meet individual or group needs, they identifiy gaps in performance or processes and plan for improvement. The roles of SBLT members are as follow: Principal facilitates, assessment teacher provides current diagnostic / progress montiroing results, SBLT members then share out the data that they have collected and dissagregated from their grade level teams. The group then suggests next steps based upon the data.

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	27	15	16	21	32	17	38	27	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	3	2	7	10	6	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	4	1	1	1	3	12	2	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	20	39	21	42	47	0	0	0	0	182

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	18	35	20	32	45	74	48	102	80	0	0	0	0	454

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	7	8	4	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	36
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected
Wednesday 8/29/2018

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	55	51	48	34	39	34	48	64	0	0	0	0	0	373
One or more suspensions	7	10	10	12	8	18	20	46	0	0	0	0	0	131
Course failure in ELA or Math	15	7	6	13	6	5	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	21	14	26	34	39	0	0	0	0	144

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	32	20	19	27	41	47	77	107	0	0	0	0	0	370

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	55	51	48	34	39	34	48	64	0	0	0	0	0	373
One or more suspensions	7	10	10	12	8	18	20	46	0	0	0	0	0	131
Course failure in ELA or Math	15	7	6	13	6	5	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	21	14	26	34	39	0	0	0	0	144

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	32	20	19	27	41	47	77	107	0	0	0	0	0	370

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 percentage of students scoring a Level 3 and above in ELA on the FSA. This is not a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The percentage of students who scored a Level 3 and above in ELA on the FSA.

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

The percentage of students who scored a Level 3 and above in ELA on the FSA.

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

Our Middle School Acceleration performance and percentage of Bottom Quartile in both ELA and Math showed improvement. Both Middle School Acceleration and percentage sif students making learning gains in math indicate an upward trend, ELA learning gains was not a trend.

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

We focused upon promoting and providing more opportunities to our Middle School students as well as deliberately (through planning, instructional practice and differentiation) serving the needs of our lowest performing population.

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	52%	62%	60%	56%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	52%	57%	48%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	48%	52%	39%	45%	49%
Math Achievement	58%	68%	61%	61%	67%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	63%	58%	51%	62%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	57%	52%	42%	58%	48%
Science Achievement	56%	63%	57%	46%	57%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	82%	77%	80%	82%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**									**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Attendance below 90 percent	18 (55)	27 (51)	15 (48)	16 (34)	21 (39)	32 (34)	17 (48)	38 (64)	27 (0)	211 (373)
One or more suspensions	0 (7)	0 (10)	1 (10)	2 (12)	3 (8)	2 (18)	7 (20)	10 (46)	6 (0)	31 (131)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (15)	8 (7)	4 (6)	1 (13)	1 (6)	1 (5)	3 (10)	12 (14)	2 (0)	32 (76)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (10)	20 (21)	39 (14)	21 (26)	42 (34)	47 (39)	182 (144)

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	55%	62%	-7%	57%	-2%	
	2017	66%	61%	5%	58%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison		-11%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	45%	53%	-8%	56%	-11%	
	2017	59%	55%	4%	56%	3%	
Same Grade Comparison		-14%					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2018	54%	53%	1%	55%	-1%
	2017	51%	54%	-3%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2018	51%	53%	-2%	52%	-1%
	2017	49%	52%	-3%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2018	46%	51%	-5%	51%	-5%
	2017	56%	51%	5%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2018	49%	54%	-5%	58%	-9%
	2017	51%	49%	2%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2018	64%	67%	-3%	62%	2%
	2017	67%	66%	1%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	56%	60%	-4%	62%	-6%
	2017	74%	66%	8%	64%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2018	59%	56%	3%	61%	-2%
	2017	54%	57%	-3%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
06	2018	47%	53%	-6%	52%	-5%
	2017	37%	53%	-16%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
07	2018	46%	63%	-17%	54%	-8%
	2017	57%	61%	-4%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2018	59%	53%	6%	45%	14%
	2017	66%	53%	13%	46%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	51%	56%	-5%	55%	-4%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	60%	56%	4%	50%	10%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		60%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	79%	74%	5%	71%	8%
2017	78%	76%	2%	69%	9%
Compare		1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	98%	62%	36%	62%	36%
2017	100%	59%	41%	60%	40%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

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	13	39	39	24	41	36	15	63			
ELL	38	40		38	50						
BLK	42	59	55	52	70	58	42				
HSP	47	48	40	45	51	36	38	67			
MUL	57	52		64	65		62				
WHT	53	47	43	59	61	47	58	81	56		
FRL	45	42	38	52	56	44	47	73	39		

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	11	35	36	21	41	42	7				
ELL	43	33		40	38						
BLK	48	38		53	59		45				
HSP	56	54	43	56	52	42	47	71	15		
MUL	68	65		71	72						
WHT	58	51	35	62	53	41	50	79	39		
FRL	52	49	34	56	50	41	41	73	20		

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	Increase overall percentage of proficeincy in ELA
Rationale	Our 2017 - 2018 Florida School Grade indicated that our school dropped 5 % points in overall Level 3 and above in ELA. The report also reported that the percentage of students making adequate progress (learning gains) in grades 3 -8 dropped from 51% to 48%.
Intended Outcome	The percentage of students acheiving proficiency in ELA and the percentage making adequate progress (learning gains) in ELA will increase.
Point Person	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	Through the implementation of a continuous improvement cycle as a data driven problem solving process, ELA proficiency will increase. Our focus each month includes Grade Level PLC's looking at student work and formative assessment results and an active SBLT that consistently reviews, reflects and make recommendations on current iReady Diagnostic testing and other progress monitoring results.
Person Responsible	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Our monitoring plan include school administration monitoring the PLC's and Data Chats for fidelity and evidence that instruction is changes based on student need, walkthrough data collected on the effectiveness of best classroom practices, and evidence that students are making gains through progress monitoring results.
Person Responsible	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$0.00**