Polk County Public Schools

Wendell Watson Elementary School



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 | 9 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 11 |

Wendell Watson Elementary School

6800 WALT WILLIAMS RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

http://schools.polk-fl.net/wwe

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2017-18 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | B Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | School | Yes | | 73% |
| Primary Servio | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 44% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |

В

В

B*

School Board Approval

Grade

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

В

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.

Wendell Watson Elementary school in partnership with family and community will provide rigorous instruction for ALL students as we prepare them for a successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will become life longlearners through rigorous learning experiences at Wendell Watson Elementary.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Burgess, Kelly | Principal |
| Poe-Liburd, Tanya | Assistant Principal |
| Jones, Deann | Teacher, K-12 |
| Greenlee, Justine | Teacher, K-12 |
| Richard, Shari | Instructional Coach |
| Oglesby, Melanie | Instructional Coach |
| Williamson, Mallory | Teacher, K-12 |
| Mellor, Crystal | Teacher, K-12 |
| Holmes, Kathryn | Teacher, K-12 |
| Latson, Carrington | Dean |
| Lain, Hilary | Teacher, K-12 |

Duties

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

The role of the School Academic Leadership team is to review all school data including state assessment scores, attendance, behavior and progress monitoring data (STAR, iSTATION, district assessments). The team plays an active role in discussing our school wide implementation of standards based instruction, high yield strategies and the differentiation of instruction K-5. The team also discusses the progress of implementation of collaborative planning school wide.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Polk - 1881 - Wendell Watson Elementary School - 2018-19 SIP Wendell Watson Elementary School

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 30 | 23 | 21 | 14 | 25 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 7 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 20 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | eve | I | | | | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 7 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 29 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | |

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 7/18/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 9 | 13 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 28 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | |
| Previously Retained | 8 | 8 | 19 | 28 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 9 | 13 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 28 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | |
| Previously Retained | 8 | 8 | 19 | 28 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | eve | I | | | | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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?

ELA has the lowest number of students scoring at or above the proficient level with 54%. The lowest individual grade level is fifth grade. This grade level has consistently stayed stagnant or declined over the last three years. Reading gains have also steadily decreased. While fifth grade performed the lowest, the overall number of students scoring at the proficient level has also continued to show a decline.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The greatest decline was in the number of students scoring proficient in third grade. This grade level had a 14% drop. This grade level also saw a large decrease in the number of students scoring proficient in math, from 74% down to 51%.

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

The ESE subgroup continues to have the largest gap when compared to the school and state average. The number of ESE students scoring at or above the proficient level in math was only 19% with the state average at 27.8%. This subgroup scored higher than the state average in ELA. Another subgroup that is not closing the gap is the African American subgroup. There was a 20% difference in the number scoring at or above proficiency in math and a 30% difference in ELA.

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

The number of students making learning gains has seen an increase over the last two years. Student learning gains in math increased by 11% this year over last year. This trend was also the same for the students in the lowest quartile, with a 16% gain. The number of students scoring at or above proficiency increased by 6% in science.

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

The focus was on providing small group instruction in reading and math. Teachers used data to guide their instruction and determine which standards to focus on during small groups. Science instruction included more vocabulary instruction during the reading block. Teachers used Words Their Way to increase instruction in prefixes and suffixes.

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 | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 55% | 50% | 56% | 59% | 48% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 50% | 51% | 55% | 58% | 49% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 45% | 48% | 50% | 42% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 60% | 58% | 62% | 65% | 54% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 58% | 56% | 59% | 54% | 52% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 44% | 47% | 43% | 41% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 62% | 53% | 55% | 69% | 46% | 51% |

| EWS Indicators as Inpu | t Earlier in the Survey |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|

| Indicator | | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 30 (1) | 23 (9) | 21 (13) | 14 (14) | 25 (9) | 17 (8) | 130 (54) | |
| One or more suspensions | 2 (0) | 1 (3) | 0 (2) | 5 (6) | 3 (2) | 2 (4) | 13 (17) | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 7 (0) | 4 (0) | 0 (0) | 13 (3) | 0 (2) | 0 (2) | 24 (7) | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 35 (13) | 20 (28) | 22 (20) | 77 (61) | |

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 | 54% | 51% | 3% | 57% | -3% |
| | 2017 | 68% | 53% | 15% | 58% | 10% |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 53% | 48% | 5% | 56% | -3% |
| | 2017 | 57% | 51% | 6% | 56% | 1% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | -15% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 56% | 50% | 6% | 55% | 1% |
| | 2017 | 55% | 44% | 11% | 53% | 2% |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 51% | 56% | -5% | 62% | -11% |
| | 2017 | 74% | 58% | 16% | 62% | 12% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -23% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 63% | 57% | 6% | 62% | 1% |
| | 2017 | 60% | 60% | 0% | 64% | -4% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | -11% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 64% | 56% | 8% | 61% | 3% |
| | 2017 | 54% | 47% | 7% | 57% | -3% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 61% | 51% | 10% | 55% | 6% | | |
| | 2017 | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 29 | 28 | 24 | 23 | 35 | 44 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 41 | 52 | 54 | 45 | 35 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 34 | 35 | 46 | 50 | 35 | 40 | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 54 | 43 | 61 | 58 | 53 | 69 | | | | |
| MUL | 56 | 57 | | 67 | 73 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 53 | 50 | 65 | 59 | 53 | 66 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 46 | 39 | 53 | 54 | 45 | 60 | | | | |
| | | 2017 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 22 | 42 | 44 | 43 | 22 | 22 | 6 | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 53 | | 69 | 41 | 50 | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 51 | 41 | 45 | 37 | 30 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | 65 | 50 | 68 | 48 | 25 | 70 | | | | |
| MUL | 85 | | | 85 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 59 | 65 | 75 | 56 | 39 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 53 | 60 | 56 | 39 | 35 | 42 | | | | |

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:

| | / #1 |
|--|------|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Title Improve Core Instruction

The number of students scoring at or above proficiency over the last three years has became stagnant. The number has not shown a large increase or decrease, while the

became stagnant. The number has not shown a large increase or decrease, while the number of students making learning gains in math has increased. The number of discipline

referrals has increased indicating a lack of student engagement.

Intended Outcome While focusing on core instruction, teachers will increase understanding of standards and learn appropriate target/task alignment. By increasing student autonomy, students will be more engaged in rigorous tasks. This will increase the number of students scoring at or

above proficiency by 8% in ELA.

Point Person

Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

Action Step

Professional Development will focus on target/task alignment and setting learning targets. Teachers will use the LSI Standards Tracker to document student mastery of standards. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning led by the instructional coaches, Shari Richard and Melanie Oglesby. Collaborative planning will focus on core instructional strategies, formative assessments and higher order questions with accountable talk. Teachers will participate in data reviews after each progress monitoring window to review

Description

student progress and differentiate instruction based on needs. Progress monitoring will include STAR, iStation, and Bear Inventory (Words Their Way). Extended Learning will be offered to students that are showing little to no growth on progress monitoring assessments.

Teachers will also participate in Learning Walks through model classrooms and book studies to assist with implementation of instructional strategies.

Instructional technology and MOSI schoolwide science programs will be used to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible

Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Monthly data chats will offer a time to review data and MTSS. Weekly walk throughs with a focus on student learning will be conducted with feedback provided to teachers. Lesson plans will be reviewed for formative assessments and higher order questions. Bi-weekly

review of student work samples will take place during PLC's. Journey and LSI Standards

tracker will assist with documenting progress of implementation.

Person Responsible

Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

At Wendell Watson Elementary several activities, committees and opportunities present themselves for parent involvement. These include SAC, PTA and volunteering. Throughout the school year, family involvement activities are planned that include movie nights, show choir nights, art and music showcase, etc. In the fall, Open house occurs. Grade levels also plan parent nights and teach/review content, standards and expectations.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Nurturing students' social-emotional needs is a top priority for the staff at Wendell Watson Elementary. Students are held to the high expectations of our school-wide behavior system which encourages them to demonstrate PRIDE not only in their academic achievements, but in their social experiences with others. Adult mentors are provided to selected students who need an another adult in their life. Wendell Watson Elementary Guidance Counselor is available for classroom guidance lessons, small groups focused on student needs and one on one check in/check out time for goal setting and follow up.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The ESE Pre-K teacher works with Kindergarten to provide a transition for students prior to the start of their Kindergarten school year. Most Pre-K students transition into an inclusion classroom and varied levels of support are provided. The middle schools representatives provide 5th grade students an overview of class scheduling and learning opportunities. This transition activity happens in the spring of each school year. 5th graders can visit the middle school or that information is provided to them at Wendell Watson Elementary. Middle school elective class groups such as band, chorus, etc. give a performance to 5th graders and provide information for students interested in those programs.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

School Leadership aligns all available resources so that all students are successful. Model classrooms are identified, PLC meetings support the needs provided by data and classroom observations. School budget funds are set aside to support professional learning through collaboration with General Education and ESE teachers. Teacher collaboration is set on a weekly basis within teams and with administration. Kelly Burgess and Tanya Poe-Liburd cooridnate all Professional Learning Community Meetings, and arrange all school leadership team meetings.

Tier 2 meetings are supported by Courtney Brown, School Psychologist, Shari Richard, Instructional Coach, Melanie Oglesby, Instructional Coach, and Michelle Vandersteen, School Counselor. Teams

Polk - 1881 - Wendell Watson Elementary School - 2018-19 SIP Wendell Watson Elementary School

meet to discuss on-going progress monitoring data and effective strategies.

Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. This program supports after-school programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

NA

| Part V: Budget | | | |
|----------------|--------|--|--|
| Total: | \$0.00 | | |