Wards Creek Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wards Creek Elementary School

6555 STATE ROAD 16, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Klein

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at 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.

Table of Contents

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)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nelson-Mitidieri, Bethany	Principal	
Klein, Kevin	Assistant Principal	
Adolf, Leanne	School Counselor	
Orta, Adriana	Instructional Coach	
Hicks, Lauren	Psychologist	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	82	90	118	115	109	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	666
Attendance below 90 percent	6	4	2	2	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	4	3	1	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	1	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

Prior Year - 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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Prior Year - 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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	79%	75%	57%	74%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	67%	58%	62%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	59%	53%	41%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	77%	63%	75%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	69%	62%	59%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	59%	51%	44%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	72%	53%	76%	69%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
Number of students enrolled	82 (0)	90 (0)	118 (0)	115 (0)	109 (0)	152 (0)	666 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (5)	4 (9)	2 (7)	2 (6)	13 (8)	3 (14)	30 (49)
One or more suspensions	4 (0)	3 (1)	1 (1)	3 (3)	0 (0)	6 (2)	17 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	5 (1)	7 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (4)	5 (6)	2 (11)	9 (21)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	77%	78%	-1%	58%	19%
	2018	85%	78%	7%	57%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	77%	2%	58%	21%
	2018	67%	74%	-7%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	77%	76%	1%	56%	21%
	2018	74%	73%	1%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	82%	3%	62%	23%
	2018	87%	80%	7%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	82%	-1%	64%	17%
	2018	76%	83%	-7%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	85%	80%	5%	60%	25%
	2018	76%	79%	-3%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	73%	-1%	53%	19%
	2018	73%	73%	0%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	54	46	55	59	69	68	36				
ASN	75	82		92	100						
HSP	68	67		89	70		71				
MUL	92	86		81	50						
WHT	80	71	69	83	75	61	73				
FRL	68	67	65	79	71	47	67				
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				

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
					2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS						
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				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	73
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

While there was significant growth from the previous year, the lowest performance was in the lowest 25% learning gains in Reading and Math. This is an ongoing trend for the school. A contributing factor is the level of ESE support that is needed and lack of differentiation with intervention.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the cohort comparison for Reading and Math in 4th grade. Both areas showed a 6% decline. A contributing factor could be increase in rigor and lack of foundational knowledge.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The school scored higher than the district and state average in all areas except Science where is was higher than the state but equal to the district average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The greatest growth was in the performance of our lowest 25% and SWD sub group. This was due to sharing of children by grade level for differentiation and increased support in ESE, with the addition of an additional ESE teacher.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One area of concern is the number of students scoring level 1 on the FSA in 5th grade.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Continued growth in the Lowest 25%
2. Raise achievement in Science
3. Close the cohort gap in 4th grade Reading and Math
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Learning Gains in the lowest 25% in Reading (specifically SWD subgroup)
Rationale	This is an ongoing area for improvement. While we showed significant growth in this area this past year, we continue to strive to have our Learning gains in all areas to meet or exceed our proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to see a 5% increase in this area for the 2019-20 school year, increasing our outcomes in this area from 65% to 70%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bethany Nelson-Mitidieri (bethany.nelson-mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using the PLC framework, data from multiple sources (iReady, FSA) will be dis-aggregated. Teachers will flexibly group students during grade level intervention times to provide remediation and enrichment specific to the are of deficit.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy has proven to be successful in the past and is research based.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teams will meet weekly to look at data and analyze student work. 2. Groups will be created to address specific needs. These groups will be flexible based on data. 3. Core team will meet quarterly to review progress monitoring data and discuss students who are not meeting expectations 4. Teachers will have data chats with administrative team and develop specific plans for students not meeting criteria. 5. Using class size flexibility, additional ESE teacher support will be provided to students to lower case load size and provide more intensive classroom support.
Person Responsible	Bethany Nelson-Mitidieri (bethany.nelson-mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% in Math (specifically SWD subgroup)
Rationale	This is a historical pattern that we have shown significant growth this year and hope to continue to close this gap.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	This subgroup will increase their learning gains percentage by 5%. Learning gains ill increase from 64% to 69%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using the PLC framework, data from multiple sources (iReady, FSA) will be dis-aggregated. Teachers will flexibly group students during grade level intervention times to provide remediation and enrichment specific to the are of deficit.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy has proven to be successful in the past and is research based.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teams will meet weekly to look at data and analyze student work. 2. Groups will be created to address specific needs. These groups will be flexible based on data. 3. Core team will meet quarterly to review progress monitoring data and discuss students who are not meeting expectations 4. Teachers will have data chats with administrative team and develop specific plans for students not meeting criteria. 5. Using class size flexibility, additional ESE teacher support will be provided to students to lower case load size and provide more intensive classroom support.
Person Responsible	Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Developing a school culture of resiliency and a growth mindset
Rationale	Building a culture of resiliency and growth leads to students who have perseverance in the face of adversity. these soft skills are critical in order to be adequately prepared for college and career readiness.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May 2020 80% of students will show characteristics of growth mind set when given a survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using the book "Mindset" by Carol Dweck as a foundation, students will be taught how to persevere and show a growth mindset in relationship to their learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Resiliency, perseverance and growth mindset are critical skills in developing children who display college and career readiness.
Action Step	
Description	1. Quarterly "Leaders with Character" assemblies to highlight one student from each class that shows a growth mindset 2. Guidance and classroom lessons on growth mindset and perseverance 3. Weekly segments on the daily news show highlighting a trait of growth mindset 4. Principal led discussion and video at each Leader with Character Assembly to highlight and reinforce the concept. 5.
Person Responsible	Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

We will continue to flexibly group students to differentiate and assure that all children receive remediation or enrichment tailored specifically to their areas of need. In Science, we will use Science content in Reading to address reading strategies and content area deficits.