

Polk County Public Schools

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

5500 YATES RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

5500 YATES RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	90%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller , Christopher	Principal	Provides leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Allen, Marieka	Instructional Coach	The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Guptill, Erin	Instructional Coach	The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Upton, Tracie	Assistant Principal	Assists the school principal by providing leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Camp, Shelley	Dean	Behavior Interventionist: The Intervention Facilitator is responsible for teacher-to-teacher classroom support, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote better behavior management strategies for teachers and students. This position will also be responsible for supporting teachers in data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based strategies and programs; and school improvement
Sherman, Timothy	Instructional Coach	The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Anderson, Katie	Teacher, ESE	LEA Facilitator: This position exists to coordinate educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. The person in this role will serve as the LEA (Local Education Agency) representative at staffings and IEP (Individual Education Plan) meetings at the assigned school. Simultaneously, this staff member will provide direct support to students with disabilities and their general education and ESE teachers to promote inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education environment
Marolda, Denise	Instructional Coach	The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2018, Christopher Miller

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 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

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	132	124	119	148	142	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	805
Attendance below 90 percent	17	25	14	13	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	1	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	6	20	6	43	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Course failure in Math	3	7	5	14	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	21	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	21	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. Star Reading	0	1	5	24	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. Star Math	0	3	17	14	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	2	6	20	20	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/20/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	131	118	122	155	135	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	800
Attendance below 90 percent	7	23	23	23	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	3	8	7	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	15	32	20	48	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	

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	7	15	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	0	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	
Number of students enrolled	131	118	122	155	135	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	800
Attendance below 90 percent	7	23	23	23	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	3	8	7	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	15	32	20	48	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	2	6	20	13	27	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	1	3	7	15	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	0	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	50%	51%	57%	49%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	51%	58%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	49%	53%	49%	50%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	60%	57%	63%	49%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	62%	53%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	47%	51%	51%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	47%	53%	56%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	48%	-9%	58%	-19%
	2018	44%	48%	-4%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
	2018	61%	50%	11%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
	2018	47%	56%	-9%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	56%	-12%	64%	-20%
	2018	62%	57%	5%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	62%	51%	11%	60%	2%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	61%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	45%	4%	53%	-4%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	21	30	32	40	49	39	29				
ELL	22	34	30	44	51	63	18				
BLK	35	39	31	40	55	43	46				
HSP	43	45	30	55	55	46	35				
WHT	60	50	50	69	63	50	63				
FRL	40	46	38	54	55	42	43				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	37	36	23	34						
ELL	21	41	37	41	63	53					
BLK	39	48	38	37	40	20	50				
HSP	43	51	48	53	62	52	58				
WHT	57	52	48	62	64	35	55				
FRL	43	48	48	49	55	40	43				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	13	39	36	29	39	35	14				
ELL	28	38	53	28	51	69	41				
BLK	29	29	25	31	50	27	17				
HSP	38	51	60	38	57	62	53				
MUL	40	54		33	31						
WHT	60	59	48	62	53	50	68				
FRL	39	50	51	38	44	48	48				

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	51
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is 4th grade ELA and mathematics, proficiency, learning gains and lowest 25% learning gains based on the 2018-2019 FSA. Our class sizes were in excess of 25+ students. We also lost support of our school-based math coach in January. Based on the 2019 winter STAR assessment, 2nd and 3rd grade performed the lowest in ELA. Support personnel were placed in 2nd and 3rd grade classrooms to provide remediation to under performing students.

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 from the prior year was 5th grade ELA and 4th grade mathematics proficiency based on the 2018-2019 FSA assessment. An ineffective math teacher and loss of our math coach contributed to 4th grade's decrease in proficiency. An ineffective ELA teacher in 5th grade and overall decrease in writing proficiency. Adjustments were made for the 2019-2020 school year. Each grade level increased based on STAR; however, 2nd and 3rd grade ELA declined from the prior year.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 4th grade mathematics proficiency and 4th grade ELA proficiency based on 2018-2019 FSA assessments. Based on the winter STAR assessment the following grade levels were below the district average; 4th grade ELA (64%/54%), 3rd Math (72%/67%), and 4th Math (74%/67%). 4th grade ELA and Math were increases from the prior year; however, they were still performing below the district average. 3rd grade did not have an ESE inclusion teacher for 1/2 of the school year, which contributed to low performance in our ESE subgroup.

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

5th grade ELA and Math showed the most gains, when analyzing data from the winter STAR assessment and prior year/grade level data.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Based on EWS Data and test data, 3rd grade ELA will be a concern for the 2020-2021 school year. First grade ELA is a concern due to ELA course failures and attendance.

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

1. Attendance
2. ELA (K-5)
3. STEM
4. PBIS
5. Math (K-5)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA data has shown to be stagnant based on FSA 2018 (51% proficient) and Winter 2019 STAR assessment (50% proficient) in all tested grade levels. Tested grade levels continuously perform either below the district average or state average ranging from two to five percent. These academic gaps continue to occur due to our performance in our subgroups. Our ELL and SWD's made minimal gains based off of FSA. ELL students are performing at 41% proficient and SWD's are 36% proficient. These two subgroups perform well below all other subgroups for the school.
Measurable Outcome:	If the school implements research based best practices, conducts daily walk-throughs, and plans collaboratively with teachers, then ELA proficiency data will increase by 5% (55%) by the spring of 2021. Our learning gains will increase from 47% to 52%, learning gains of the lowest 25% will increase from 37% to 42%. For our low performing subgroups, our ELL's will increase from 40% to 46% and our SWD's will increase from 34% to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Administration and leadership team will conduct daily walk-throughs targeting whole group and small group instruction to determine trends across grade levels and school-wide. During collaborative planning, teachers will work to tier student tasks to target student needs based on data (whole group and small group). Administration and teachers will monitor student progress towards mastery of standards on a weekly basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will continue to implement formative assessments to drive our small group instruction along with building support schedules for our coaches and paraeducators to assist in small group instruction. Kindergarten through second grade will implement SIPP's (phonics based direct instruction) to help teach phonics to students. During collaborative planning, teachers, coaches, and administration will work to tier small group instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Administration will also conduct daily walk-throughs to monitor the fidelity and trends of small group instruction. We will continue to discuss whole group instruction during our weekly collaborative planning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration and Leadership Team structures walks during small group instruction times.
2. Formative Assessments
3. Tiered Small Group Instruction
4. SIPP's- phonics based instruction
5. STEM materials- for enhancing instruction in Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics
6. The school based ELA and Math will assist in providing coaching in small groups and reviewing data with teachers to make instructional decisions.
7. Teachers will utilize Weekly Reading Wonders Assessments to monitor student progress towards mastery of each standard.
8. Paraeducator will be utilized to assist with small group remediation and instruction.
9. Social Studies weekly will be provided to classrooms to help enhance literacy instruction with balancing non-fiction text.

Person Responsible Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on our 2018-2019 FSA results, Mathematics data is showing an increasing trend overall. However, our ELL and SWD's made minimal gains based off of FSA. ELL students are performing at 41% proficient and SWD's are 36% proficient. These two subgroups perform well below all other subgroups for the school. Based on quarterly district assessment Science has decreased by 20 points in proficiency this past school year. Students are performing better in Math than in ELA. For the 2020-2021 school year, we will begin to implement STEM lessons into each classroom to create a more challenging Math and Science learning environment.

Measurable Outcome:

Based on Spring 2021 FSA data, student proficiency in Math and Science will increase by 5% (60%-65%) as students will be exposed to rigorous lessons that encompass the STEM framework and will be challenged to think critically. Learning gains for the school will increase from 59% to 64% and learning gains for the bottom 25% will increase from 45% to 50%. For our low performing subgroups, our ELL's will increase from 40% to 46% and our SWD's will increase from 34% to 40%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will develop students into critical and innovative thinkers through inquiry-based learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

We will integrate STEM challenges to tie academic disciplines together and assist students in applying problem-solving skills to real world situations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration and Leadership Team structures walks during small group instruction times.
2. Formative Assessments will be implemented in Math to formulate targeted small groups.
3. Tiered Small Group Instruction to meet the needs of all learners.
4. Paraeducator will assist in pulling small groups for remediation and instruction.
5. STEM materials- for enhancing instruction in Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics
6. The school based Math coaches will assist in providing coaching in small groups and reviewing data with teachers to make instructional decisions.
7. Administration and select teachers will attend the STEM conference to learn more about implementing STEM and enhancing instruction to be more hands-on.
8. Substitutes will be provided for grade levels to have additional planning/PD to implement STEM initiatives.

Person Responsible

Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After analyzing discipline data from the 2018-2019 to 2019-2020 school years, there was an increase in student discipline referrals. More specifically, student referrals increased on buses and common areas, such as PE and recess areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on our previous year's data, if we implement CHAMPs and PBiS (bus/classroom/school-wide) with fidelity, then our discipline referrals will decrease by 10% for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will continue to implement PBiS and CHAMPs with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This area of focus was selected because student referrals increased during the 2019-2020 school year. We had staff turnover during the school year, which contributed to the increase. Staff members became more relaxed in implementing PBiS and CHAMPs and reteaching when necessary. To monitor the effectiveness of the discipline goal, discipline incident data will be collected and analyzed on a monthly basis to determine the progress.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and staff members will be trained/retrained in PBiS. Each staff member will receive a PBiS handbook that outlines the purpose, procedures, common language, daily lessons, and school vision for PBiS. Teachers and staff will also be trained in CHAMPs to create a common language across the campus. The behavior interventionist will provide classroom coaching and assist with implementing PBiS and CHAMPs. The behavior interventionist will also monitor teacher/student referrals. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to monitor progress of implementation and monitor student discipline data.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Based on the needs assessment/analysis, 3rd grade ELA and 1st grade ELA are areas of concern that will be addressed in our school-wide areas of focus. We have two school-based Literacy Coaches and two school-based Math Coaches. Both of these subjects area teachers will be a focus for the school and will meet to plan weekly with school based coaches and administration. Coaches and administration will conduct daily targeted walk-throughs and lesson plan checks. K-2 classrooms will be utilizing SIPP (a phonics based program) to help with phonics instruction.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At R. Bruce Wagner Elementary, we foster all student learners and their families. We hold meaningful Family Nights to help promote different aspects of our students learning. Parents and families can attend the events and learn new ways to help their child at home. R. Bruce Wagner Elementary will begin implementing STEM initiatives into our lessons for the 2020-2021 school year. All students will now be exposed to critical thinking, hands on learning, and collaboration with their classmates. Each student learner is taken into consideration when creating engaging lessons with utilizing technology to enhance instruction. RBW has been a model PBiS School since 2013! We celebrate our students behaviors through a point system (token economy) that is individual to each student. Throughout the school-year, students can participate in school-wide dances, Spring Fling, and other various activities. We value our students, families, and the community and always welcome volunteers.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00