Marion County Public Schools

Ward Highlands Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| | |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Ward Highlands Elementary School

537 SE 36TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Treasa Buck

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2019

| 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 | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 98% |
| 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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (64%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | rmation* |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | <u>Cassandra Brusca</u> |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

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

School Board Approval

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

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

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Ward Highlands Elementary School

537 SE 36TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

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 | Yes | 84% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 37% |
| School Grades History | | |

2017-18

C

2015-16

В

2016-17

Α

School Board Approval

Year

Grade

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

2018-19

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.

Ward-Highlands Elementary School seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success through developmentally appropriate instruction that allows for individual differences and learning styles. Our school promotes a safe, orderly, caring, and supportive environment. Each student's self-esteem is fostered by positive relationships with students and staff. We strive to have our parents, teachers, and community members actively involved in our students' learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ward-Highlands Elementary School is a place where all students can learn; academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere. Teachers and staff work tirelessly to promote a positive school environment and raise student preformance. Our goal is to work in a partnership with our parents and community to create an environment where students are empowered to discover their strengths and to achieve their maximum potential. Our entire school community shares the belief that all children can and will learn.

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 |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Altobello, Kristin | School Counselor | The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. |
| Woelfel, Kelly | School Counselor | The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. |
| Buck, Treasa | Principal | The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision—making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need; and communicates with parents as necessary. |
| Smiley, Carmen | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas. |
| Jones, Tim | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|------------------------|--|
| Valden, essica | Instructional Coach | The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development. |
| cook, racy | Dean | The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 129 | 129 | 130 | 175 | 122 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 832 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 13 | 13 | 24 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 11 | 4 | 19 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 5 | 13 | 34 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 39 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | lotai |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 15 | 16 | 49 | 26 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | | |

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

47

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

Prior Year - 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 | 3 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 10 | 17 | 18 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 5 | 24 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 45 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 3 | 16 | 41 | 35 | 35 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | | | | | G | rade | Le | vel | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|---|----|----|----|----|------|----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 10 | 17 | 18 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 5 | 24 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 45 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | | 16 | 41 | 35 | 35 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |

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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | | |
| ELA Achievement | 55% | 47% | 57% | 61% | 52% | 55% | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 65% | 56% | 58% | 63% | 57% | 57% | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | 52% | 53% | 56% | 53% | 52% | | |
| Math Achievement | 59% | 51% | 63% | 69% | 52% | 61% | | |

| School Grade Component | | 2019 | | 2018 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| Math Learning Gains | 67% | 58% | 62% | 78% | 54% | 61% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 64% | 49% | 51% | 60% | 43% | 51% | |
| Science Achievement | 52% | 47% | 53% | 72% | 51% | 51% | |

| Indicator | | | Total | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 129 (0) | 129 (0) | 130 (0) | 175 (0) | 122 (0) | 147 (0) | 832 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 (3) | 13 (15) | 13 (12) | 24 (15) | 3 (17) | 11 (6) | 67 (68) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (1) | 11 (10) | 4 (17) | 19 (18) | 10 (14) | 14 (7) | 58 (67) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 (1) | 5 (5) | 13 (24) | 34 (6) | 4 (7) | 9 (10) | 66 (53) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 59 (52) | 39 (45) | 58 (30) | 156 (127) |

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 | 41% | 44% | -3% | 58% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 46% | 9% | 57% | -2% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -14% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 62% | 49% | 13% | 58% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 43% | 9% | 56% | -4% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 57% | 45% | 12% | 56% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 46% | 6% | 55% | -3% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 5% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 44% | 49% | -5% | 62% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 48% | 5% | 62% | -9% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 04 | 2019 | 63% | 54% | 9% | 64% | -1% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 47% | 12% | 62% | -3% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 10% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 61% | 45% | 16% | 60% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 69% | 50% | 19% | 61% | 8% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 2% | | | | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 51% | 44% | 7% | 53% | -2% | | | | | | |
| | 2018 | 59% | 49% | 10% | 55% | 4% | | | | | | |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 15 | 48 | 53 | 32 | 61 | 74 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 56 | 86 | | 61 | 79 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 60 | 54 | 38 | 67 | 69 | 17 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 71 | | 54 | 64 | | 40 | | | | |
| MUL | 62 | 72 | | 46 | 67 | | 100 | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 65 | 58 | 65 | 67 | 58 | 57 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 59 | 53 | 53 | 63 | 63 | 41 | | | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | ONENT | 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 | 19 | 35 | 39 | 41 | 52 | 48 | 30 | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 49 | 67 | 36 | 57 | 48 | 26 | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 52 | | 58 | 42 | | 79 | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | 50 | | 55 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 47 | 41 | 67 | 57 | 47 | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 48 | 45 | 54 | 53 | 37 | 51 | | | | |

| | 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 | 27 | 47 | 50 | 51 | 61 | 50 | 64 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | 82 | | 50 | 67 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 36 | 40 | 53 | 70 | 59 | 36 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 64 | 77 | 73 | 60 | 67 | 67 | 61 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 61 | 42 | | 83 | 75 | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 68 | 61 | 73 | 82 | 59 | 84 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 56 | 55 | 63 | 74 | 60 | 58 | | | | | | | |

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 | 59 |
| 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 | 55 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 475 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgro | շաբ | υa | ιe |
|--------|-----|----|----|
|--------|-----|----|----|

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 43 |
| 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 | 67 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 47 |
| | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 55 |
| 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 | 69 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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.

Our students in 3rd grade performed below the district and the state average. Throughout the school year we worked with supporting our students with needs identified on their IEP along with students not yet identified with specific needs through the IEP process. There was a high percentage of students identified as ESE in 3rd grade.

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

The greatest decline was in 3rd grade ELA proficiency. Throughout the school year we worked with supporting our students with needs identified on their IEP along with students not yet identified with specific needs through the IEP process. There was a high percentage of students identified as ESE in 3rd grade.

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.

Our 3rd grade fell below the district in ELA and Math. For ELA in 3rd grade we were 17% below the state and in Math we were 18% below the state. Throughout the school year we worked with supporting our students with needs identified on their IEP along with students not yet identified with specific needs through the IEP process. There was a high percentage of students identified as ESE in 3rd grade.

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

Our students in 4th grade improved 10% in math compared to how they scored in 3rd on the Math FSA. ELA was not far from that improvement as well with our 4th grade students. Tier 1 instruction in 4th grade is all standards and needs based. Data from 3rd grade was used to guide instruction at the beginning the year and then iReady growth monitoring, diagnostics, and QSMA data was used the remainder of the year. Our ELA and Math CAS played a positive role during collaborative planning and modeling in the classrooms.

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

We have two areas of concern with our students. Attendance in grades KG-5th with students missing more than 10 days of school. The second concern are suspensions in grades 2nd-5th grades.

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

- 1. Increase learning gains with our 3rd grade retained students
- 2. Alternative consequences for students in 3rd, 4th, 5th
- 3. Decrease the percentage of students missing 10 or more days of school
- 4. Increase proficiency in ELA and Math with our lowest 25%
- 5. Increase learning gains with our student's with disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title

Collaboration Using data to guide instruction

Rationale

Showing growth in the number of points earned with learning gains on FSA in ELA and Math is an indication that students improved more than one year's worth of growth.

State the

measurable school plans to achieve

If we provide teachers with supported collaboration opportunities focusing on data collected outcome the from FSA ELA and Math, iReady growth monitoring and diagnostics, QSMAs, and DRA then we will increase the percentage of points earned with learning gains in the area of ELA from 65% to 68% and in the area of Math from 67% to 70% as indicated on the FSA.

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome

Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidencebased Strategy

Our teachers, administration, and content area specialists will collaborate to monitor student data, use results to develop individualized instruction and pull resources to assist students in reaching their learning targets. Teachers and content area specialists will implement the action plan developed during collaborative planning with fidelity using the resources and strategies identified based on data.

If teachers are routinely looking at data on individual students and adjusting their instruction to meet the current needs of their students utilizing the evidence based resources identified by the school then we will see an increase in our students growth based on data.

Rationale

for

Evidencebased Strategy

- 1. iReady online instruction, growth monitoring data, and diagnostic data
- 2. ELA and Math interventions identified by the district based on individual student data collected from FSA, iReady, DRA, and QSMAs
- 3. Weekly collaborative planning sessions with teachers and content area specialists utilizing data and standards
- 4. Biweekly paraprofessional trainings based on data and student need on effective instructional strategies and district approved interventions for ELA and Math.

Action Step

- 1. Data from multiple sources will be dissected to create an area of focus for the grade level, individual classroom, and individual student.
- 2. Training will occur with teachers and paras on evidence based strategies, interventions, and instructional resources needed based on data.
- 3. Monitoring of student growth through iReady monthly growth monitoring, iReady diagnostic 1 and 2, and quarterly QSMA/standards check data.

Description

- 4. Grade level/subject area collaborative planning sessions will take place weekly to evaluate the plan, adjust instruction and resources based on the current student data.
- 5. The leadership team will meet weekly to discuss academic growth per grade level, teacher, and reporting categories for FSA and ESSA.
- 6. The leadership team will monitor attendance and behaviors of students with 2 or more EWS indicators.

Person Responsible

Carmen Smiley (carmen.smiley@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2

Title

Instructional: ELA/Writing Proficiency

Rationale

Increasing the reading and writing proficiency of our students will allow students the tools needed to be successful in all academic areas including reading, math, writing, science, social studies, technology and the arts. Students who have a solid foundation in phonics will have a stronger ability to increase their proficiency in reading. When students are provided with instruction on their level they are move motivated to attend school which will increase our daily rate of attendance.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

If we integrate literacy across content areas with differentiated instruction then we will increase the percentage of students proficient in reading from 55% to 62% according to the end of year FSA and in writing from 54 to 62 according to the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidencebased Strategy

The school will utilize CKLA phonics program in grades KG-3rd grade. Training will occur with teachers and paraprofessionals on effective phonics instruction. Phonics interventions approved by the school district will be implemented in grades 3rd-5th based on phonics data collected from iReady diagnostic and growth monitoring. iReady online instruction in phonics will be provided to each student exhibiting a need on the iReady diagnostic. The school will utilize Top Score Writing in grades 3rd-5th grades. CKLA writing, vocabulary, and reading instruction will be utilized in grades KG-5th. iReady vocabulary instruction will be used in KG-5th grade for students who have mastered phonics.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy

The phonics instruction provided using CKLA will align with the tier 1 reading instruction provided for our students as well the specific phonics needs based on grade level instruction. iReady online instruction will identify and provided instruction based on student need. iReady will adjust the level of instruction based on the performance of the student. Increasing vocabulary and strengthening reading skills in our students will increase proficiency in text based writing.

Action Step

Reading

- 1. The iReady diagnostic 1 will be provided to all of our students in grades KG-5.
- 2. Training will be provided for our teachers in utilizing the iReady data.
- 3. Training will be provided to teachers and paras in CKLA phoics implementation.
- 4. The leadership team and teachers will monitor phonics data monthly and adjust instruction based on student need.

Description

- 5. Weekly ELA collaborative planning will take place between grade level teachers, content area specialists, and administration looking at data and available resources. Writing
- 1. Training provided by the district on Top Score Writing for our 3rd-5th grade teachers.
- 2. Training provided by the content area specialist on CKLA writing strategies in KG-5th grades.
- 3. Data meeting held at the beginning of they year to identify the area of focus in writing by grade level.
- 4. Training for teachers in KG-5th on the FSA writing rubric and scale.

5. Data meetings held with teachers, content area specialist, and administration after each district writing assessment.

Person Responsible

Tim Jones (timothy.jones1@marion.k12.fl.us)

| #3 | |
|--|--|
| | |
| Title | School-Wide Goal- Behavior and Attendance |
| Rationale | Providing a school-wide focus on expectations and career planning will provide students with a structured learning environment across the campus. We will increase desired behaviors and attendance through positive reinforcement and building an intrinsic motivation to be successful as a member of society. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | If the school provides a focus on the 5 soft skills (teamwork, positive work ethic, communication, positive attitude, dependability and reliability) then discipline referrals will decrease from 424 to 375 and our attendance rate will increase from a daily rate of 94% to 96%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Tracy Cook (tracy.cook@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence- based Strategy | The teachers and staff will focus on the same 5 soft skills as indicated above when developing expectations and classroom management plans. The leadership team will develop expectation in areas across campus outside of the classrooms. |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy | The 5 soft skills were developed based on the basic expectations of employers. The skills can be applied across all areas of school, home, and the community. Our teachers were already teaching students these skills just not using the same language. Providing our school with a universal language that can be implemented across all disciplines. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Slow roll out to teachers in August 2019 with posters and school expectations. Student introduction and Pep rally with speakers for all 5 soft skill in September 2019. Quarterly Soft Skill Champions from each homeroom class. KG-2 school wide event with community helpers. 3rd-5th school wide event with career day. |
| Person Responsible | Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@marion.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).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

Parent/teacher organization meetings are held 7-10 times per school year where families, staff, and the community come together to create and implement an action plan addressing academic and emotional needs of our students. The school will also hold quarterly SAC meetings for families, staff, and the community to learn about the school's vision, mission, goals, and progress throughout the year. Parents will be invited and encouraged to participate ion Family events such as Family Fun Night, Parent Conference nights, Publix math nights, Open House, and Reading Nights for parents. *Quarterly assessments and ongoing iReady data will allow us to monitor student achievement.

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.

WHES follows the 10 critical elements of the PBIS system. Counseling is also made available for students who are struggling through social issues. An antibullying initiative is put on through school counselors and the Dean of Students. Social skills training is provided by our school psychologist to our students who are serviced in EBD and TUB units. Students who are struggling with their daily behaviors are often placed on check in/check out systems overseen by the dean or by another administrator. Character education words are reviewed and discussed by administrators daily on the morning show.

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

Each spring, our Guidance Dept. is contacted by preschools that serve our school concerning registration information, transportation, tours, and school hours. In addition, anytime a parent registers a child for Kindergarten, a readiness handout is distributed.

In addition, VPK is offered in the county to assist with preschool transitioning. The Elementary Director from the district office evaluates the quality and effectiveness of these transition programs. During the first month of school, FLKRS is used to assess student readiness rates and to determine individual student needs to be addressed by the Kindergarten and remedial teachers.

The school will implement Sanford Harmony in grades KG-5th for all students. This will be a shared responsibility with our guidance counselors and teachers.

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 school based leadership team should consistently monitor student achievement data and provide intervention opportunities to students as needed. Progress should be monitored and interventions

adjusted based on student growth data. Resources are monitored through the close supervision of school administration to ensure practical and effective use.

• The school based team identifies areas in need of improvement and sets annual goals that are articulated in the SIP. An action plan is created to address each goal area. The team then meets periodically to set individual goals for students and to progress monitor student growth. Teachers are included in conversation of student growth and their professional growth needs are identified and prioritized through these conversations and results of team meetings. Data is consistently leveraged to adjust the action plan and to address the new areas of need.

Title I, Part A

Ward-Highlands Elementary School has several programs that coordinate with other state and federal dollars available and integrate federal and state programs, so the school can meet state requirements. Title I funds will be provided to support after-school tutoring. The Centers, a mental health facility, partners with our school whenever we need specific student mental health services for any of our students. Funds from applicable federal, state, and local programs such as: IDEA-funding paraprofessionals; Title 1-funding Staff Development, personnel, and materials; Title IV-Red Ribbon Program are integrated and coordinated to meet all student needs.

Title X- Homeless

District homeless social worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social service referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate public education.

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

Marion County Public Schools implements standards provided by the state that are set to prepare students for success and make them competitive in the global workplace. Each Florida Standard provides clear expectations for the knowledge and skills students need to master in each grade (K-12) and subject so they will be prepared to succeed in college, careers and life. Although Ward-Highlands is a Pre K-5 school, we do have an annual Career Day used to introduce students to the different careers/jobs that help the community function. Guests share how a passion for knowledge and learning has helped them be successful.

In grades KG-2nd students learn about multiple careers including community helpers. The special area teachers highlight their individual craft on early release days. Students participate in the arts, sports, and author visits. This school year we will implement soft skills with all of our students. The soft skills were developed through a survey of business owners and what characteristics they look for in candidates.