

St. Johns County School District

Wards Creek Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Wards Creek Elementary School

6555 STATE ROAD 16, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-wce.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

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	27%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 9/25/2018.

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.

At WCES we ensure Achievement, Learning and Leadership for ALL.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To build and sustain a culture that provides a safe environment where all stakeholders collaborate to ensure growth and achievement for ALL.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Mitidieri, Bethany	Principal
Klein, Kevin	Assistant Principal
Adolf, Leanne	School Counselor
Orta, Adriana	Instructional Coach
Hicks, Lauren	Psychologist

Duties

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

Each member of the School Leadership Team serves a member of the MTSS Core Problem Solving Team. In their role on this team they share in the following responsibilities:

- Attend core meetings and MTSS review meetings with teacher
- Review Tier 1 instructional practices and provide research-based strategies
- Help develop Tier II and Tier III academic and behavior plans

In addition to the joint leadership roles, the individuals contribute to our school through these responsibilities:

Bethany Mitidieri - Principal

- Participate in parent conferences
- Provide classroom observations
- Support initiatives and provide resources
- Provide training to staff/teachers on MTSS procedures, progress monitoring and related interventions
- Model instructional practices
- Ensure fidelity of school mission and vision
- Ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards

Adriana Orta - Instructional Coach

- Take minutes during the meeting and send out to all team members
- Develop agenda for MTSS meetings
- Schedule meetings to review MTSS plans with teachers

- Develop progress monitoring probes
- Review school wide progress monitoring information
- Provide training to staff/teachers on MTSS procedures, progress monitoring and related interventions
- Finalize MTSS referral packet and submits to LEA
- Aligns and guides teachers in the use of instructional resources
- Models best instructional practices

Lauren Hicks - Psychologist

- Responsible for gathering attendance data
- Responsible for gathering behavior data
- Graph students' progress monitoring data
- Make the MTSS team aware of health/medical conditions that may impact learning
- Participate in parent conferences

Kevin Klein - Assistant Principal

- Participate in gap analysis
- Participate in parent conferences
- Provide classroom observations
- Main contact for behavior and discipline

Leanne Adolf - Guidance Counselor

- File paperwork for MTSS students into the MTSS folder
- Update data into the MTSS digital database
- Send home referrals based on vision and hearing needs
- Refer students/parents to appropriate community resources
- Participate in parent conferences
- Perform classroom observations
- Conduct guidance lessons based on specific areas of need
- Main contact for mental health needs

Our School Leadership Team meets weekly to discuss SIP goals, core instruction, resource allocation, teacher support systems, and small group needs. Additionally, we discuss individual students who are struggling to meet grade level expectations or are having social/emotional difficulties.

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	5	9	7	6	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	4	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected

Monday 7/23/2018

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	5	3	10	9	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	5	3	10	9	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	

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 learning gains in our lowest 25%. Yes, this is an ongoing trend for the school.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that declined was high standards in Science

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

The data component that was below the state average was ELA Learning Gains for the students in the lowest 25%

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Learning Gains in Math

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

The actions that led to this improvement were departmentalization in 4th grade as well as 5th grade. This provided more time for Math instruction. We also used iReady Math which creates a custom learning path for each student to remediate deficit areas. Teachers used the data collected from the iReady diagnostic assessment to group students and remediate as well. Last year was the first year so it is not yet a trend.

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	73%	72%	56%	77%	68%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	59%	55%	65%	59%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	48%	48%	53%	46%
Math Achievement	77%	77%	62%	80%	70%	58%
Math Learning Gains	70%	67%	59%	64%	63%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	58%	47%	50%	60%	46%
Science Achievement	71%	68%	55%	79%	66%	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	5 (5)	9 (3)	7 (10)	6 (9)	8 (11)	14 (10)	49 (48)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (1)	3 (1)	0 (6)	2 (2)	7 (10)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (2)	1 (3)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	6 (14)	11 (27)	21 (41)

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	85%	78%	7%	57%	28%
	2017	77%	80%	-3%	58%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	67%	74%	-7%	56%	11%
	2017	71%	74%	-3%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2018	74%	73%	1%	55%	19%
	2017	77%	75%	2%	53%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	87%	80%	7%	62%	25%
	2017	67%	80%	-13%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	76%	83%	-7%	62%	14%
	2017	76%	82%	-6%	64%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2018	76%	79%	-3%	61%	15%
	2017	77%	80%	-3%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	73%	73%	0%	55%	18%
	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	35	35	33	34	36	33	43				
ASN	70			60							
HSP	67	56		76	75		65				
MUL	84	59		88	59						
WHT	74	63	45	77	71	51	73				
FRL	59	49	34	66	64	42	60				
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	43	54	45	44	46	37	35				
ASN	50			60							
BLK	58			75							
HSP	80	70		69	39						
MUL	94			81							
WHT	74	61	41	75	60	47	75				
FRL	64	59	43	64	52	40	70				

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	Learning gains in the lowest 25% in Reading
Rationale	According the the data there is trend of low levels of learning gains for our students in the lowest 25% in Reading. This is a historical pattern.
Intended Outcome	To show growth of 20% or more in the learning gains of this sub group
Point Person	[no one identified]
Action Step	
Description	A third ESE support facilitator was added to lower case load numbers and increase student contact time. The majority of the students in the lowest 25% are students with disabilities. This will allow the ESE teachers to collaborate more closely with the students and teachers they serve. All students have a daily intervention time that is flexible grouped based on specific content needs in Reading. In addition ESE students have an additional intensive Reading intervention for 30 minutes using high yield, research based interventions. the MTSS Core team will frequently discuss the performance of the students in the lowest quartile and admin will conduct data chats with teachers quarterly regarding these students. Classroom teachers will be working on common formative and summative assessment to further identify areas of need and to provide remediation.
Person Responsible	Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Students will be progress monitored quarterly and teachers will have data chats with admin to track progress and ensure fidelity.
Person Responsible	Kevin Klein (kevin.klein@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Learning gains in the lowest 25% in Math
Rationale	According the the data there is trend of low levels of learning gains for our students in the lowest 25% in Math This is a historical pattern.
Intended Outcome	To show growth of 20% or more in the learning gains of this sub group
Point Person	Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Math PLC will meet bi-weekly with admin to identify power standards, create common formative and summative assessments and analyze data to ensure mastery. A third ESE support facilitator was added to lower case load numbers and increase student contact time. The majority of the students in the lowest 25% are students with disabilities. This will allow the ESE teachers to collaborate more closely with the students and teachers they serve. All students have a daily intervention time that is flexibly grouped based on specific content needs in Math. The MTSS Core team will frequently discuss the performance of the students in the lowest quartile and admin will conduct data chats with teachers quarterly regarding these students. Classroom teachers will be working on common formative and summative assessment to further identify areas of need and to provide remediation. in grades4and 5, teachers team and focus primarily on two content areas. This will allow for more time to work on mastery.
Person Responsible	Adriana Orta (adriana.orta@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Teachers will bring artifacts to these PLCs and administration will be present for the discussion to ensure fidelity. Teachers will have data chats with admin regarding the lowest 25% on a quarterly basis.
Person Responsible	Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3	
Title	Students making learning gains on the FSAA
Rationale	Students who took the Florida Alternate Assessment did not make adequate learning gains.
Intended Outcome	Increase the number of students making learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment by 50%
Point Person	Kevin Klein (kevin.klein@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Self contained ESE teachers will meet in PLC's to discuss the format of the assessment and develop activities that will give students practice in these types of questions and responses. We will also seek assistance from the PD contacts from the school district, FDLRS and FIN to assist the teachers in forming groups and designing activities that are aligned to the FSAA. Whenever possible students will be mainstreamed into the general education setting for more exposure to grade level standards using access points. Teachers will learn how to utilize resources available to them such as CPALMS. In biweekly PLC's with administration, self contained ESE teachers join their grade level teams that are most closely aligned to their students demographics and ability level. Teachers will also meet with admin quarterly to provide evidence and updates of progress monitoring and level of support needed.
Person Responsible	Kevin Klein (kevin.klein@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Administration will meet with teachers to assist in the development and review student evidences. Teachers will meet with admin quarterly to review artifacts and progress.
Person Responsible	Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)