J.L. Wilkinson Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

J.L. Wilkinson Elementary School

4965 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://wes.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Carolyn Hayward

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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

J.L. Wilkinson Elementary School

4965 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://wes.oneclay.net

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-6	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

At Wilkinson Elementary, we provide high levels of learning for all students. We increase student achievement by having high standards and expectations in which students value and develop a drive, desire, and passion for learning. This is achieved by students being actively engaged in the learning process. By creating an optimal learning environment built on respect, safety and kindness, all students are achievers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wilkinson Elementary exists to provide a safe, caring and stimulating environment to prepare life long learners for success by assisting them in acquiring the necessary skills to achieve their fullest potential in a competitive global workplace.

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
Hayward, Carolyn	Principal	Supervisor of school and all school activities. SAC Member
Pichoff, Lacey	Teacher, K-12	Math Instructional coach grades k-2
Dibble, Ian	Teacher, K-12	Fourth Grade Team Leader. SAC Member
Sheffield, Lindsey	Teacher, K-12	PE Coach and Resource Team Leader. SAC Member
Anloague, Arnold	School Counselor	FSA and MTSS support. Counselor for grades K,2,4,6. SAC Member
Miller, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Sixth grade team lead. SAC Member
Simmons, Stephen	Instructional Coach	Science Instructional Coach K-6 Title I compliance. SAC Member
Romito, Karen	Teacher, K-12	KG team lead. SAC Member
Joshua, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Fifth grade team lead. SAC Member
Wallace, Anthony	School Counselor	Counselor of grades PK,1,3,5,
Hoffman, Kara	Assistant Principal	Head of discipline, Leader of PBIS and staff Professional Development
Massey, Brian	Instructional Coach	Math Instructional Coach grades 3-6
Amidon, Sara	Teacher, K-12	1st grade team lead. SAC member
Traywick, Kaley	Teacher, K-12	Third grade team lead. SAC member
Jones, LeAnne	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach K-3 reading.
McLane, Kathi	Teacher, ESE	ESE team lead. SAC member
Wright, Kathryn	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chairperson

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/25/2020, Carolyn Hayward

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.*

4

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

61

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

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	78	106	99	91	92	101	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	674
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	4	9	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

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	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	4	9	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	4	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	4	9	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	53%	65%	57%	45%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	62%	58%	51%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	53%	58%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	70%	63%	53%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	66%	62%	51%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	56%	51%	40%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	65%	53%	42%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**							**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	47%	68%	-21%	58%	-11%
	2018	46%	68%	-22%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	64%	-17%	58%	-11%
	2018	43%	62%	-19%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	55%	62%	-7%	56%	-1%
	2018	49%	59%	-10%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
06	2019	60%	64%	-4%	54%	6%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	52%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	71%	-16%	62%	-7%
	2018	53%	70%	-17%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	69%	-13%	64%	-8%
	2018	63%	66%	-3%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	50%	64%	-14%	60%	-10%
	2018	56%	65%	-9%	61%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
06	2019	62%	70%	-8%	55%	7%
	2018	71%	68%	3%	52%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	63%	-6%	53%	4%
	2018	59%	64%	-5%	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	34	44	50	38	50	40	44				
BLK	60	54		55	31						
HSP	42			50							
MUL	50			60							
WHT	53	58	58	57	57	40	57				
FRL	49	57	64	54	51	38	56				
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	33	59	63	44	60	46	34				
BLK	43	82		43	82						
WHT	50	66	71	62	73	56	60				
FRL	47	63	69	58	70	57	59				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	28	38	47	34	38	34	11				
BLK				38							
WHT	47	53	63	53	50	39	44				
FRL	42	45	50	46	46	35	37				

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	381
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	
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	50
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	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	54
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	53
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.

Bottom quartile math showed the lowest performance. Due to third year of a multi-year transition to Eureka Math curriculum and a large population of scholars lacking core foundational math skills and in MTSS for math specific intervention.

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

Bottom quartile math showed the lowest performance. Due to second year of a multi-year transition to Eureka Math curriculum and a large population of scholars lacking core foundational math skills. A large proportion of WES scholars are deficient in core foundational skills based on iReady diagnostics.

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.

Bottom quartile math showed the lowest performance. Due to second year of a multi-year transition to Eureka Math curriculum and a large population of scholars lacking core foundational math skills.

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

Overall ELA proficiency schoolwide showed the greatest area of improvement. This was due to Intentional targeted implementation of strategic small groups school wide, along with leveraging district curriculum specialists and school based content area coaches.

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

A large number of retentions in Kindergarten and first grade as well as attendance. KG and First grade students with deficient foundation skills based on iReady diagnostics

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

1. Math bottom quartile
2. ELA proficiency
3. Increase attendance school wide
4. Consistent school wide SEL and PBIS curriculum, strategies and tools.
5. Increase and strengthen use of technology in the classroom and STEM activities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Specific area of instructional focus will be to Increase bottom quartile math performance. In an increase in this area will close the achievement gap in overall math proficiency. This are has been identified by most recent FSA results, and student growth and achievement on i Ready Diagnostics.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to increase bottom quartile math proficiency from 40%-50% in grades 3-6 as measured by FSA spring 2021 and iReady reading diagnostic grades KG-2
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of the Data Driven Inquiry cycles (PLCs) to analyze student performance on an ongoing basis to determine utilization of interventions and supports.Continuous math coaching cycles utilizing on site math coaches, as well as district math curriculum specialists.This will address both lower quartile growth and overall proficiency
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing a continuum of data analysis and strategic intervention implementation of personnel and material resources will provide the most current assessment of the effectiveness of targeted strategies, tools and resources. It will also allow the ability to adjust, tailor and move resources as needed through continual monitoring of student data and performance to address both lower quartile growth and overall proficiency

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategic use of instructional coaches for targeted groups (Coaching Cycles)
2. Strategic intervention groups utilizing research based strategies and tools for instruction
3. Use of Data Driven Inquiry PLC's to drive instruction by analyzing assessment and student work.
4. Use of district level math specialists
5. Classroom walkthroughs / observations
6.Targeted coaching support with math coaches in grades k-3 and 3-6
7. Academic Intervention Groups formed to support lower quartile scholars, concept extension groups to help with proficiency
8.Continuous coaching and daily support for math teachers
9.Continuing DDI (Data Driven Instruction) Professional Development with Dr. Johnson (year 2)
10. Increase STEM activities for common cross curricular language and instructional intentionality with math and science classes
11. Utilization of one to one chromebooks for online assessment, instruction, and synthesis of student generated projects in math and science.
13. .2 Title I funded assistant to assist in small groups

Person Responsible	Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A strategic focus will be place on achieving increase in overall reading proficiency schoolwide. In an increase in this area will close the achievement gap in overall reading proficiency.An increase in proficiency will also translate across curriculums and assist in closing achievement gaps in other content areas
Measurable Outcome:	Wilkinson's goal is to increase overall ELA proficiency from 52% to 60%.schoolwide measured by FSA spring assessments 3-6 and final iReady reading diagnostic grades KG-2
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of the Data Driven Inquiry cycles (PLCs) to analyze student performance on an ongoing basis to determine utilization of interventions and supports as well as intentionally targeted small group instruction. Targeted use of school based content area coaches and leveraging district level curriculum specialists on a continual basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing a continuum of data analysis and intervention implementation will provide the most current assessment of the effectiveness of targeted strategies,instruction methods, tools and resources. Frequent monitoring of student data and achievement will assure that the correct personnel, supports and materials are being optimally utilized

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategic use of instructional coaches for intentionally targeted groups (Coaching Cycles)
2. Strategic intervention groups utilizing research based strategies and tools for instruction
3. Use of Data Driven Inquiry PLC's to drive instruction by analyzing assessment and student work.
4. Use of district level ELA specialists
5. Classroom walkthroughs and observations
6. Strategic, targeted implementation of SRA, SIPPS, LLI, iReady Toolkit, LAFS, and intentional phonemic awareness instruction in primary grades.
7.Focused reading interventions and coordinated supports with paraprofessionals
8.Scope and Sequence for Kindergarten
9.Continuing DDI (Data Driven Instruction) Professional Development with Dr. Johnson (year 2)
10. One to one chromebooks for online assessment, instruction, and synthesis of student projects
11. Title I funded ELA teacher to reduced class size in 6th grade
12. .2 Title I funded assistant to help with small groups
13. Access to additional (Lively Letters & comprehension Toolkit) to increase proficiency

Person Responsible	Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Specific area of instructional focus will be to Increasing science proficiency. In an increase in this area will close the achievement gaps in that content area,as well as broaden science inquiry knowledge and scientific discourse..This are has been identified by most recent FSA results, and student proficiency data on Performance Matters year long assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to increase overall proficiency from 46% to 60% in grade 5 as measured by FSA spring 2021 and End of year performance matters assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of the Data Driven Inquiry cycles (PLCs) to analyze student performance on an ongoing basis to determine utilization of interventions and supports.Continuous science coaching cycles utilizing on site dedicated science coaches, as well as district science curriculum specialists.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing a continuum of data analysis and strategic intervention implementation of personnel and material resources will provide the most current assessment of the effectiveness of targeted strategies, tools and resources. It will also allow the ability to adjust, tailor and move resources as needed through continual monitoring of student data and performance

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategic use of instructional coaches for targeted groups (Coaching Cycles)
2. Strategic intervention groups utilizing research based strategies and tools for instruction,
3. Data Driven science Inquiry PLC's to drive instruction by analyzing assessment and student work.
4. Accessing district level science specialists and coaches
5. Classroom walkthroughs and observations
6.Targeted coaching support with science coaches in grade 5
7.Continuous coaching and daily support for science teachers
8. DDI (Data Driven Instruction) Professional Development with Dr. Johnson (year 2)
9 STEM lessons for cross curricular language and instructional intentionality with math and science classes
10 One to one chromebooks for online assessment, instruction, synthesis of student projects in science.
11.Use of makers station in library during resource wheel to extend science and STEM learning
12 Title I funded teacher to reduce class size
13.Title I funded science coach.
14. Additional science consumables purchased to supplement classroom instruction

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.

ELA ,Math and Science proficiency will be a schoolwide priority with coaches, assistants and teachers trained in identifying and instructing in data driven small groups based on individual student data. Additionally, this data be reviewed in weekly DDI groups as well as monthly meeting with grade levels. WES will continue its second year of its "Building a Data Driven Culture" professional development at "Wildcat U" Wednesdays of each week throughout the school year.Continuous coaching cycles and daily coaching/instructional support in ELA, Math and Science with be available.

Attendance of brick and mortar and One Clay Online students will be monitored and prioritized through "Student Success" meetings with admin and school social worker on a monthly basis as well as the PBIS team working in accordance with guidance to help reduce absentee rate across the school.

SEL and PBIS will be prioritized through the use of the "7 Mindset" curriculum as well as a PBIS behavior reward system. WES will continue to impalement its "Wildcat 200" program, as well as positive office referrals to infuse positive behavior practices and social emotional curriculum throughout the school across all grade levels

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.

Wilkinson Elementary parents and guardians are contacted via a monthly newsletter, email, phone calls, social media as well as flyers. Additionally, each child on campus is given a student planner; the planner's main function is to communicate the academic and social progress of the child each day. Some of the technological resources that we use to stay connected with families are: Twitter, Facebook, Focus Parent Portal, Class DoJo, S'More Newsletters, WES School web page, teacher created websites, email and Peachjar. Principal and Grade Level newsletters sent home monthly and posted online, and the OneClay app. Teachers will also continue to use "Friday Folders" each week that will serve as an addition communication tool for parents and WES. Additionally, the WES School Advisory Committee or SAC team will meeting four times in the 2020 / 21 school year. The WES SAC Committee's purpose is to build a cohesive collective of stakeholders to lead and have input on the direction of school-based decisions. Parents will comprise a majority of the committee. Input for school-based decisions, parent activities and Title I requirements will be reviewed in SAC meetings with a focus on parents input in creation and carrying out these objectives. Specific information and input provided by parents and community stakeholders for the creation and revision of the WES Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP), and Schoolwide

Improvement Plan (SIP) will be gleaned in these year long SAC Meetings. Parent and family engagement activities are carefully planned and coordinated with all relevant stakeholders to be the most beneficial for all participants. Input for these activities are taken with the the parents and community in mind to make them as beneficial and relevant as possible. During the school year as parent events occur, teachers divide up responsibilities for events to attract parents from various grade levels to attend the events. The staff will plan Literacy Week, Patriots Pen, Data Night, Conference Night, Parent Orientation, two flexible Title I annual meetings, as well as two separate "Conference Nights" for parents. One in the fall, one in the spring. These meetings give parents the opportunity meet and speak in depth regarding their students progress. Title I parent / school compacts are reviewed and signed ant these meetings. WES also plans all its activities with flexible times so all parents have opportunity to attend. Through SAC, Parent feedback forms at PFE events, and input for creation of the SIP and PFEP. specific barriers have been identified and addressed in order to increase parents capacity at WES. Specific barriers are 1.) to plan the parent involvement activities being cognizant of varying times of the events, mornings, during the school day and evenings and child care limitations.Considerations are taken into account on the time of day as well as the day of the week. 2.) We offer our parents activities with varied times of the events, mornings, during the school day and evenings. Day care and special transportation can also be provided

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: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00