

The School Board of Highlands County

Fred Wild 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	22

Fred Wild Elementary School

3550 YOUTH CARE LN, Sebring, FL 33870

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~fwe/>

Demographics

Principal: Megan Moesching

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2019

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)	100%
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: C (45%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: D (40%) 2014-15: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	22

Fred Wild Elementary School

3550 YOUTH CARE LN, Sebring, FL 33870

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~fwe/>

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	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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.

All students are challenged to reach their maximum potential. We provide a safe environment to grow, inspire and empower the learners of today to become leaders of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fred Wild will grow, inspire and empower leaders.

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
Moesching , Megan	Principal	
Baxter, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Music Teacher, Specials Team Leader
Eldon, Kristy	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade ELA/SS Teacher/Team Leader
Youlden , Sean	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade HAART Teacher/Team Leader
Owens , Leslie	School Counselor	
Burke , Allisa	Assistant Principal	
Perry, Leigha	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade HAART Teacher/Team Leader
Camacho , Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Math/Science Teacher/Math and Science Representative
Whitaker, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade ELA/SS Teacher/Team Leader
Ouverson, Susan	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade ELA/SS Teacher/Team Leader
McGee, Whitney	Instructional Coach	

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	0	104	77	77	79	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	449
Attendance below 90 percent	2	34	19	16	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	20	4	11	13	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	27	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	1	11	1	9	12	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	15	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

37

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/15/2019

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	1	15	17	25	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	14	13	14	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	20	15	32	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	73	92	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	15	17	25	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	14	13	14	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	20	15	32	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	73	92	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	43%	50%	57%	42%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	54%	58%	51%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	49%	53%	40%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	57%	63%	49%	59%	61%
Math Learning Gains	43%	57%	62%	48%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	44%	51%	35%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	45%	53%	54%	47%	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	0 (0)	104 (0)	77 (0)	77 (0)	79 (0)	112 (0)	449 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 (1)	34 (15)	19 (17)	16 (25)	15 (8)	25 (7)	111 (73)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (14)	0 (13)	0 (14)	0 (22)	0 (22)	0 (85)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	20 (20)	4 (15)	11 (32)	13 (22)	46 (23)	94 (112)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (73)	27 (92)	53 (63)	90 (228)

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	46%	50%	-4%	58%	-12%
	2018	32%	48%	-16%	57%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	49%	-8%	58%	-17%
	2018	36%	45%	-9%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	37%	45%	-8%	56%	-19%
	2018	40%	47%	-7%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	56%	10%	62%	4%
	2018	52%	61%	-9%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	60%	-2%	64%	-6%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	23%	49%	-26%	60%	-37%
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	43%	-10%	53%	-20%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	23	31	30	37	38	35	25				

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
ELL	26	44	38	53	55	60					
BLK	30	40	50	29	30	29	4				
HSP	43	52	46	51	49	52	40				
MUL	50			54							
WHT	51	63	44	58	43	47	41				
FRL	42	51	48	47	42	44	29				
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	16	38	33	27	50	52	11				
ELL	19	50	73	43	54	60					
BLK	29	33	35	39	52	41	28				
HSP	36	44	71	45	50	63	43				
MUL	33			58							
WHT	41	41	42	62	48		54				
FRL	35	42	54	47	51	53	41				
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	17	22	13	35	33	15	18				
ELL	20	44	58	42	56						
BLK	33	36	20	41	40	17	29				
HSP	38	56	56	50	53	50	65				
WHT	55	52	40	53	46		58				
FRL	39	49	40	48	48	35	50				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	52
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	50
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	46
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.

Science achievement showed the lowest performance at 32% achievement, decreasing 12 percentage points. Over the past 3 years the Science achievement has steadily decreased, we believe the contributing factor is students reading ability. Students reading proficiency is low and the science assessment requires students to use comprehension skills to be successful on the test.

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

Science achievement was the greatest decline from the 17-18 school year. The factors leading to this decline were an increased focus on reading and math instruction, which decreased the focus on Science instruction. Another component is students comprehension skills.

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 greatest gap when compared to state average is also our Science Achievement with a 21 point gap. The State average is 53% and ours was 32%. The factors leading to this gap were an increased focus on reading and math instruction, which decreased the focus on Science instruction. Another component is students comprehension skills.

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

ELA learning gains made a 10 percent increase, as well as ELA proficiency made a 8 percent increase.

Teachers were working with the reading coach and with peers to plan for instruction. All classrooms allowed time for students to independently read at their specific reading levels.

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

The potential area for concern based on our EWS data is 90 of our 3rd, 4th and 5th graders received a Level 1 the FSA ELA or Math. This accounts for 33% of our students and when looking further into the data the majority of these students also fall into the SWD or Black/African American sub populations. We have put measures in place to target these students during support facilitation, WIN time and small group differentiated instruction on grade-level.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains
2. ELA L25 Learning Gains
3. Math Learning Gains
4. Math L25 Learning Gains
5. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	ELA learning gains increased from 42% to 52% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019. This increase also contributed to an 8 point increase in ELA achievement. Our main focus will be ELA Learning Gains which will ultimately increase ELA achievement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to increase ELA Learning gains by 12 points (from 52% to 64%). We will measure learning gains using FSA (4th/5th/3rd Retentions) and iReady (1st-3rd). All students have the opportunity to make a learning gain which ultimately moves him/her towards proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Allisa Burke (burkea@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy	<p>In order to increase ELA Learning Gains we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meet as grade-level PLCs (Professional Learning Communities) every Tuesday for 50 minutes. The PLC team will comprise of grade-level team members, ESE support facilitation teachers, our literacy coach, administration and when applicable district curriculum coaches. During PLC, lessons will be planned based on grade level standards and data analysis. Lessons will be focused on reading strategies to improve learning. - Implement WIN Time (What I Need Time) daily for 1st-5th for 30 minutes. WIN Time will be a time for reading interventions to take place. The interventions will be decided upon using data and planned for once monthly during PLCs. - Provide strategic intervention time daily for 30-45 minutes in addition to the 90 minute reading block. -WIN Time- All teachers and students will participate in targeted reading intervention for 30 minutes each morning. -Our reading coach and district reading coaches will use the model of effective coaching cycles to provide support to teachers.
--------------------------------	---

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>All students will receive 90 minutes of grade-level core instruction. One recommendation that offers a strong body of evidence, and is highly utilized, is to teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies. Examples of effective reading comprehension strategies taught using a gradual release of responsibility framework include questioning, comprehension monitoring, drawing inferences, and summarizing. The 30-45 minutes of strategic intervention time will allow for students at a higher risk of not meeting end of year benchmarks, more time in explicit, systematic instruction on foundational skills or vocabulary and comprehension development. Explicit instruction in small groups involves more teacher-student interaction, including frequent opportunities for student practice and comprehensible and specific feedback. WIN time will focus on foundational reading skills in order to close gaps students have in reading.</p>
--	---

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning Communities one time per week with administration and Reading Coach 2. What I Need (WIN) time every morning based on students needs; PLC one time per month to analyze data 3. Strategic intervention within schedule; fidelity to the schedule and time frames 4. Small groups within Reading Blocks 5. Fidelity to district approved curriculum (CKLA and i-Ready)
--------------------	---

Person Responsible Megan Moesching (moeschinm@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2

Title Math Learning Gains

Rationale Math Learning Gains decreased from 51% to 43% and Math Achievement was stagnate from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 at 49%. All students have the opportunity to make a learning gain which ultimately moves him/her towards proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

We will increase Math Learning Gains from 43% to 53%. We will measure learning gains using FSA (4th/5th/3rd Retentions) and iReady (1st-3rd).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Megan Moesching (moeschinm@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

In order to increase Math Learning Gains we will:
 - Meet as grade-level PLCs (Professional Learning Communities) every Tuesday for 50 minutes. The PLC team will comprise of grade-level team members, ESE support facilitation teachers, administration and when applicable district curriculum coaches. During PLC, lessons will be planned based on grade level standards and data analysis. Lessons will be focused on curriculum maps, test specifications and rigor of standards. We will also use the model of effective mathematics instruction and teacher planning tool for effective mathematics instruction.
 - Provide strategic intervention time daily for 30 minutes in addition to the 60 minute math block.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

During PLC we will be analyzing student work and data in order to ensure students are mastering grade-level standards. Teachers will plan lessons using the Standards for Mathematical Practice and the teacher planning tool for effective mathematics instruction. This will assist teachers in planning skillful math lessons. We will use iReady data to progress monitor students in order to provide the appropriate strategic intervention in addition to the 60 minute math block. We plan to utilize the iReady toolbox and Tools for Instruction for lessons during the math intervention time.

Action Step

Description

1. PLC - Math, weekly
2. 30 minutes Strategic Intervention Time
3. Following district curriculum map, curriculum and effective instruction model

Person Responsible Megan Moesching (moeschinm@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Science achievements has steadily decreased over the past several years . A 14% decreased from 2017-2018 (44%) to 2018-2019 (32%)
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase Science Achievement from 32% to 42% in the 2019-2020 school year as indicted by the 2020 Science Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Megan Moesching (moeschinm@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Grade level planning to include backwards design of unit assessments and grade level standards. 5th grade will plan using Test Specs, as well as grade level standards. During WIN Time for the 2nd nine weeks we will be using science content to teach reading strategies. These reading strategies include class choral reading, multi syllabic word instruction and sentence syntax. 5th grade will also implement the 5E model for effective instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The 4th grade ELA achievement scores are a predictor for the following years 5th grade Science Achievement. Our 5th graders this year left 4th grade 41% proficient in reading. Using the reading comprehension strategies with science text will build our students ability to independently understand content rich text.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fidelity to district adopted science curriculum 2. Strategic planning with 5E model 3. Grade Level Planning 4. WIN Time
Person Responsible	Megan Moesching (moeschinm@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile
Rationale	ELA Learning gains decreased from 54% to 48% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve
 Our goal for 2019-2020 school year is to increase ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile from 48% to 56% as indicated by the 2020 ELA FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome
 Allisa Burke (burkea@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy
 In order to increase ELA Learning Gains we will:
 - Identify and monitor students who fall within the lowest quartile in ELA.
 -Meet as grade-level PLCs (Professional Learning Communities) every Tuesday for 50 minutes. The PLC team will comprise of grade-level team members, ESE support facilitation teachers, our literacy coach, administration and when applicable district curriculum coaches. During PLC, lessons will be planned based on grade level standards and data analysis. Lessons will be focused on reading strategies to improve learning. Identified students will be monitored during PLC's and strategies to assist students will be discussed.
 -Administration/instructional coaches will monitor progress on students monthly.
 -Students will receive "What I Need" time daily to ensure their specific needs are being met.
 - Students will receive strategic intervention time daily for 30-45 minutes in addition to the 90 minute reading block.
 -Teachers will be trained in the Elements of Effective Teaching which will provide teachers support to ensure solid effective instruction is being provided.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy
 All students will receive 90 minutes of grade-level core instruction. One recommendation that offers a strong body of evidence, and is highly utilized, is to teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies. Examples of effective reading comprehension strategies taught using a gradual release of responsibility framework include questioning, comprehension monitoring, drawing inferences, and summarizing. The 30-45 minutes of strategic intervention time will allow for students at a higher risk of not meeting end of year benchmarks, more time in explicit, systematic instruction on foundational skills or vocabulary and comprehension development. Explicit instruction in small groups involves more teacher-student interaction, including frequent opportunities for student practice and comprehensible and specific feedback. WIN time will focus on foundational reading skills in order to close gaps students have in reading.

Action Step

- Description**
1. WIN Time
 2. Differentiated Small Group instruction
 3. Effective Instruction by classroom teacher
 4. Frequent progress monitoring by admin/instructional coaching
 5. Teachers will be involved in weekly PLC's

Person Responsible Megan Moesching (moeschim@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#5

Title Math Lowest Quartile

Rationale Math Lowest Quartile Learning gains decreased from 43% to 45% from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve Our goal is an increase from 45% to 55% (10 percent increase) from 2018-2019 to 2019-2020 as indicated on the 2020 Math FSA>

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Megan Moesching (moeschinm@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

In order to increase Math Learning Gains with students in the lowest quartile we will:

- Identify and frequently progress monitor students who are in the lowest quartile.
- Meet as grade-level PLCs (Professional Learning Communities) every Tuesday for 50 minutes. The PLC team will comprise of grade-level team members, ESE support facilitation teachers, administration and when applicable district curriculum coaches. During PLC, lessons will be planned based on grade level standards and data analysis. Lessons will be focused on curriculum maps, test specifications and rigor of standards. We will also use the model of effective mathematics instruction and teacher planning tool for effective mathematics instruction.
- Provide strategic intervention time daily for 30 minutes in addition to the 60 minute math block.
- Provide Differentiated Small Group instruction
- Provide support to teachers with the elements of Effective Instruction to ensure that students are being given high quality instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

During PLC we will be analyzing student work and data in order to ensure students are mastering grade-level standards. Teachers will plan lessons using the Standards for Mathematical Practice and the teacher planning tool for effective mathematics instruction. This will assist teachers in planning skillful math lessons. We will use iReady data to progress monitor students in order to provide the appropriate strategic intervention in addition to the 60 minute math block. We plan to utilize the iReady toolbox and Tools for Instruction for lessons during the math intervention time.

Action Step

Description

1. Weekly PLC
2. Identify and frequently monitor students in the lowest 25%
3. Differentiated Small group instruction
4. Admin/Instructional Coaches will utilize the Math IPG to ensure teachers are teaching effective lessons.
5. Fidelity to the district approved curriculum.

Person Responsible Megan Moesching (moeschinm@highlands.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).

Our other school wide improvement priorities include increasing our ELA Achievement and Math Achievement. We believe targeting learning gains in both ELA and Math will result in all students moving towards proficiency in both areas. All students have the ability to make a learning gain in one year but all students will not be able to achieve proficiency in one year.

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, 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.

Fred Wild Elementary conducts an annual Title 1 meeting each year in September as well as bi-monthly SAC/PTO meetings to inform parents about Title 1 programs and the use of Title 1 funds. Parents are encouraged to participate in SAC and PTO meetings. Discussions regarding the school budget are had during SAC meetings and decisions are made regarding Title 2 monies. Parental input is sought at each meeting and through school-wide surveys each spring. When comments, concerns or input are given, either the principal or assistant principal make notes and comments are documented in the minutes of the meeting. Parents are notified of the Parent Family Engagement Plan review and Home/School compact through newsletters, flyers, and backpack notifications. Report card conference nights give parents the opportunity to spend one on one time with their child's teacher to discuss the child's achievement and how the parent can further support the child.

Teachers schedule conferences with parents before and after school hours, interpreters are provided for meetings. Parents are invited into the classroom to review the progress of their student by the teacher or through student led conferences. Parent involvement nights are scheduled in the late afternoon and evening. Both the school social worker and the migrant home liaison assist in going to homes to communicate with parents. During the first SAC meetings, times and dates are discussed and scheduled.

Back to School Orientation - August 6th

Dads Take Your Child to School - September 25th

AVID Night (5th Grade Parents) - September 26th

Parent Report Card Night - October 17th/March 26th

Thanksgiving Lunch - November 20th

Holiday Night (Chorus Concert/Literacy) - December 3rd

Christmas Lunch - December 18th

Wildcat Fest - March 12th

Awards Day - May 18th to the 20th

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.

Fred Wild be implementing Morning Meeting Routines in all classrooms to build relationships, teach/ model citizenship, values, and manners.

Guidance resource provides individual support for students.

We have a mentoring program where different community members come in to meet with students and provide a positive role model for them.

We have a mental health counselor that we refer students to based on our monthly Threat Assessment meetings.

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

Transition meetings occur with the guidance counselor, administrators and reading coach for students moving from Kindergarten to FWE for 1st grade and 5th graders moving to middle school. Our 5th graders also have the opportunity to visit the middle school they are zoned for in order to learn about scheduling and to see the campus.

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.

PLC will take place every Tuesday where grade levels will meet to plan grade-level standards based lessons and discuss data and student work from previous lessons taught.

The Leadership Team along with the MTSS team reviews student's data to determine an intervention that can help with areas of need. Students are progress monitored weekly, biweekly, or monthly; depending on the criteria set by the MTSS committee. The students' progress is then reviewed every four weeks to determine the next steps, whether to continue the intervention or change it. The reading coach provides training to the persons responsible for implementation of the intervention. The guidance counselor then monitors the fidelity of interventions that are in place. In addition, the entire core (Tier 1) is monitored four times a year during progress monitoring. To enhance our students' academic achievements, a highly qualified certified retired teacher provides tutoring to those students who need the intervention.

To help support our students and their families, we use the services and funds provided to us in an intentional manner. We meet monthly with PTO and SAC in order to appropriately allocate the funds we have to make the highest impact. We have several parent nights throughout the school year. These parent nights are for our whole student population and their families to promote the academic work of their students and to inform them of how they can impact their child's academic success. In order to reach our migrant population we have a liaison on campus and at parent nights. The liaison provides a pathway of communication with those families.

Every child in our school has access to free breakfast and lunch. Our students also partake in the fruits and vegetable program to help support healthy nutrition.

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

5th grade teachers and students participate in AVID. AVID focuses on the use of organizational tools such as binders, planners and WICOR strategies. AVID will focus on Focused Note-Taking and Higher Level Questioning in the 2019-2020 school year. We follow state standards in order to prepare students for college and the workplaces of tomorrow. We also receive donations throughout the year from local churches who provide items such as school supplies and gift cards to make our students schooling experience more positive.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00