R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

5500 YATES RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

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	Yes	97%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

We will ensure learning takes place for all through high expectations, family involvement, and instruction rich in communication & technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students, families, and staff work hand in hand to develop responsible, respectful, reliable, lifelong learners . . . every child, every family, every day...Learning for All; Whatever it Takes!

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Miller , Christopher	Principal
Allen, Marieka	Instructional Coach
Guptill, Erin	Instructional Coach
Weeks, Sudi	Instructional Coach
Upton, Tracie	Assistant Principal
Camp, Shelley	Dean
Rast, Bobby	Other

Duties

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

Christopher Miller- Principal, Lead meetings and monitor all school data
Tracie Upton- Asst. Principal, Assist in gathering school assessment data and monitoring MTSS
Maria Simich- Guidance Counselor, Lead PST meetings and work with teachers to gather data for students
Leonette Weeks- Math Coach, Monitor and analyze data, especially in math; support teachers with interventions
Marieka Allen-ELA Coach Kg-2nd grade, Monitor and analyze data, especially in reading; support teachers with
interventions
Erin Guptill- ELA Coach 3rd-5th grade, Monitor and analyze data, especially in reading; support teachers with
interventions
Shelley Camp-Dean-support implementation of CHAMPS and PBIS, monitor discipline data
Bobby Rast-ESE Facilitator, Monitor and analyze data; support teachers with interventions

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	26	26	32	16	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	13	8	11	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	24	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	4	8	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	2	12	21	28	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 8/1/2018

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	7	18	15	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	37	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	4	5	2	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	7	18	15	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	37	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	4	5	2	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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?

Based on 2017-2018 FSA data 3rd grade ELA proficiency performed overall 41 percent proficient, 4th grade had 38 percent learning gains in ELA, and 4th and 5th grade bottom quartile had 26 percent and 35 percent learning gains which were the lowest performing components. Trend data indicates that 3rd grade ELA and 4th grade ELA learning gains are consistently the lowest performing components, while the other components show no trend data.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Based on 2017-2018 FSA data the component that showed the greatest decline from the previous school year was learning gains of the bottom quartile in ELA and Math.

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

When comparing data from the school to the state, 3rd Grade ELA and Math had the greatest gap in achievement.

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

Based on 2017-2018 data, discipline had the most improved data with a 60 percent decrease as compared to the previous year. Math proficiency in grades 3-5 also was a major improvement as compared to the previous school year.

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

Actions and changes that led to the improvement of discipline and overall math proficiency was the departmentalization of grades 4 and 5, revamped PBIS program, focused Math planning, and the implementation of school-wide CHAMPs.

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	49%	50%	56%	48%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	51%	55%	57%	49%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	48%	46%	42%	46%
Math Achievement	56%	58%	62%	52%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	59%	57%	52%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	44%	47%	52%	41%	46%
Science Achievement	55%	53%	55%	61%	46%	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	0 (0)	26 (7)	26 (18)	32 (15)	16 (8)	35 (7)	135 (55)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (1)	4 (5)	2 (3)	3 (1)	3 (2)	13 (12)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	13 (0)	8 (0)	11 (0)	4 (0)	13 (0)	49 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	26 (34)	24 (37)	41 (18)	91 (89)

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	41%	51%	-10%	57%	-16%
	2017	44%	53%	-9%	58%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	44%	48%	-4%	56%	-12%
	2017	51%	51%	0%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018	61%	50%	11%	55%	6%
	2017	47%	44%	3%	53%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	47%	56%	-9%	62%	-15%
	2017	45%	58%	-13%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	62%	57%	5%	62%	0%
	2017	62%	60%	2%	64%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2018	49%	56%	-7%	61%	-12%
	2017	37%	47%	-10%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	51%	51%	0%	55%	-4%
	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	21	37	36	23	34						
ELL	21	41	37	41	63	53					
BLK	39	48	38	37	40	20	50				
HSP	43	51	48	53	62	52	58				
WHT	57	52	48	62	64	35	55				
FRL	43	48	48	49	55	40	43				

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	13	39	36	29	39	35	14				
ELL	28	38	53	28	51	69	41				
BLK	29	29	25	31	50	27	17				
HSP	38	51	60	38	57	62	53				
MUL	40	54		33	31						
WHT	60	59	48	62	53	50	68				
FRL	39	50	51	38	44	48	48				

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	Kindergarten through 3rd Literacy
Rationale	Based on FSA data, 3rd grade ELA trends show that less than 50% of students are proficient readers.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is to Increase reading proficiency based on STAR, FSA, and iSatation.
Point Person	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Action Step

Description	Teachers will implement LSI Ignite in all grades, 2nd grade teachers will use SIPPs for small group instruction with support from Literacy Coach, network manager will pull small groups of retained 3rd graders, in addition to continued collaborative planning in ELA with support form literacy coaches, and AR (points, active minutes, required 2 test per week and 50/50 fiction/non-fiction)
Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	In order to monitor the effectiveness leadership will monitor standards through the LSI Standards Tracker and Growth Tracker, SIPPs Assessments, STAR Data, AR Montly Reports, and Weekly Reading Wonders Assessments.
Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Lowest 25% Learning Gains ELA and Math
Rationale	Based on classroom walk-throughs and performance data, there is a lack of clear understanding of the MTSS framework, tier interventions, and the ability to enhance or adjust instruction as appropriate.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is to increase learning gains in the lowest 25 in ELA from 47% to 54% (7 percentage point gain) and Math Lowest 25% from 40% to 54% (14 percentage point gain) on the Florida Standards Assessment.
Point Person	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	The actions steps to reach our goal is to implement LSI ignite, revamp MTSS, implement small group instruction with fidelity, monitoring for learning and taking actions during instruction, and to increase student autonomy.
Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	In order to monitor the effectiveness, leadership will monitor LSI implementation with the Standards and Growth Trackers, STAR SGP will be monitored semi annually, (mid-year and spring) to see growth in student learning.
Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Activity #3	
Title	Implementation of PBiS
Rationale	After analyzing discipline data from the 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 school years, there was a 60 percent decreased in referrals.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is to continue implementation of school-wide expectations with fidelity and staff promoting a positive climate, then office discipline referrals will decrease 10%.
Point Person	Shelley Camp (shelley.camp@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	In order to reach our intended outcome, we will continue to implement CHAMPs and PBIS with fidelity.
Person Responsible	Shelley Camp (shelley.camp@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	To monitor the effectiveness of the discipline goal, discipline incident data will be collected and analyzed on a monthly basis to determine the progress.
Person Responsible	Shelley Camp (shelley.camp@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, Â§ 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.

Our school's Title I Parent Involvement Plan outlines the Parental Involvement targets for our school. This plan can be found on our schools website at the following address: http://schools.polk-fl.net/rbw/titleone.htm

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.

Skillstreaming lessons are utilized by teachers when a class need or small group need is identified within the class or grade level. The guidance counselor supports the affective needs of students through whole class guidance lessons each year, small group meetings, and some individual counseling support. A mentoring program is in place that matches adults (parents or community members) with individual students or small groups of students for support that is focused more on social-emotional rather than academic help. The school personnel works in tandem with itinerant personnel (social worker, mental health counselor, psychologist) to share pertinent information related to student emotional health. Monthly grade level MTSS meetings address academic and behavioral interventions for each teacher's class.

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

Beginning with Kindergarten Round Up in the spring, incoming kindergarten students are screened for basic identification of letters, numbers, shapes, and knowledge. The screening information is provided to the classroom teacher to assist in initial planning for instruction. Kindergarten teachers will utilize other screening tools within the first weeks of the school year to individually assess students knowledge of multiple pre-reading related skills and knowledge. FAIR will be utilized three times a year to monitor students' growth towards grade level expectations.
For students exiting our school for the middle school setting, collaboration with 6th grade teachers occurs in the spring, and the middle school teachers visit our campus to meet with, and do learning activities with the students.

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.

The Leadership Team meets once a week to formally to ensure the alignment of personnel, material resources, and teacher & student needs for support. Following each series of progress monitoring data collection, Leadership Team members assist teachers with data dis-aggregation. Monthly meetings related to MTSS are also held with the Leadership Team members each being matched with a teacher from the grade level, in order to ensure proper focus is given to coordinating support. All funding

received through federal, state, or local funds will be utilized as stipulated from the originating agency or organization in order to support student learning, address academic deficits, meet basic student needs, parent involvement programs and initiatives, and providing for support personnel or materials that will support student learning with ELL, & ESE. We will use Title I funds to support learning. •Title I, Part A project funds school-wide services at our eligible and participating Title I schools. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions so that all students achieve academic success.

Title II funds provide professional development resources to build the capacity of teachers by funding consultants, district professional development personnel, including district/regional coaches, and curriculum specialists. The Title II project contributes to the recruitment/retention of teachers in the district by funding district recruitment personnel, recruitment initiatives both within and outside the school district.

Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, professional learning opportunities for school staff, as well as parent family engagement opportunities.

Title IX – Homeless OR HEARTH Program funded through Title IX and Title I, provides support for students identified as being in a homeless situation. Title I provides support for this program, through funding of HEARTH staff, professional development, and contracted extended learning services for students.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget	
Total:	**$0.00**