

Hardee County Schools

Wauchula 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

Wauchula Elementary School

400 S FLORIDA AVE, Wauchula, FL 33873

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/wauchula_elementary

Demographics

Principal: Mary Sue Maddox

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Hardee County School Board on 10/8/2020.

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

Wauchula Elementary School

400 S FLORIDA AVE, Wauchula, FL 33873

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/wauchula_elementary

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	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	60%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Hardee County School Board on 10/8/2020.

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.

Building learning partnerships with home, school, and community to ensure personal and academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The mission of Wauchula Elementary School is to provide our children with equal educational opportunities and to inspire our students to become lifelong learners while in a safe environment.

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
Farr, Mary	Principal	The principal provides oversight for the implementation of school based initiative, ensuring the use of data-based decision making. She assesses the skill levels of school staff to determine professional development that will support ongoing school improvement.
Hays, Karen	Teacher, PreK	As a grade level leader, this teacher will serve on the LLT to provide information about core instruction, participate in the collection & analysis of data, and collaborate with the grade level members to implement school-based initiatives.
Bond, Chelsea	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level leader, this teacher will serve on the LLT to provide information about core instruction, participate in the collection & analysis of data, and collaborate with the grade level members to implement school-based initiatives.
Carlton, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level leader, this teacher will serve on the LLT to provide information about core instruction, participate in the collection & analysis of data, and collaborate with the grade level members to implement school-based initiatives.
Ward, Shadow	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal provides expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment & interventions to support school-based initiatives, as well as insight on issues relating to attendance/behavior incentives and interventions that support school-based initiatives.
Bellfower, Cristy	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach participates in the design and delivery of professional development and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Additionally, she assists in identifying student needs and analyze existing literature on scientific-based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches.
Graham, Meghan	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level leader, this teacher will serve on the LLT to provide information about core instruction, participate in the collection & analysis of data, and collaborate with the grade level members to implement school-based initiatives.
DeLoera, Yessenia	Teacher, K-12	As a grade level leader, this teacher will serve on the LLT to provide information about core instruction, participate in the collection & analysis of data, and collaborate with the grade level members to implement school-based initiatives.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Mary Sue Maddox

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	106	108	88	102	77	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	585
Attendance below 90 percent	5	0	4	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	5	8	6	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	4	6	5	6	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	3	3	4	3	5	0	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	7	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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 6/30/2020

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	108	106	104	82	114	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	13	16	9	8	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	9	11	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	2	2	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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		14	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	1	0	0	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	108	106	104	82	114	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	13	16	9	8	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	9	11	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	2	2	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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		14	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	1	0	0	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	62%	56%	57%	56%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	57%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	52%	53%	48%	56%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	71%	63%	67%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	70%	62%	58%	66%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	61%	51%	46%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	43%	53%	50%	47%	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	68%	59%	9%	58%	10%
	2018	67%	57%	10%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
	2018	54%	50%	4%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	50%	48%	2%	56%	-6%
	2018	53%	51%	2%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	71%	69%	2%	62%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	80%	68%	12%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	73%	4%	64%	13%
	2018	70%	64%	6%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	58%	62%	-4%	60%	-2%
	2018	62%	65%	-3%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	42%	11%	53%	0%
	2018	48%	45%	3%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	43	43	23	60	66	60	40				
ELL	46	36	20	65	45	40	22				
BLK	55	61		60	53						
HSP	53	43	36	65	54	52	35				
WHT	77	66		83	71	77	81				
FRL	54	48	39	65	56	47	47				
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	44	34	50	53	45		38				
ELL	35	42	42	68	53						
BLK	48	38		71	53						
HSP	54	51	59	65	60	49	46				
WHT	75	46		79	59		69				
FRL	55	51	55	67	59	44	47				

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	31	36	18	40	46	73	25				
ELL	17	37	47	56	56		9				
BLK	40	50	60	50	50	40	23				
HSP	47	53	47	61	55	48	42				
MUL	40			50							
WHT	76	69		81	64	45	75				
FRL	44	52	55	55	52	50	39				

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	56
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	57
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	50
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	76
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	52
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.

In 2019, ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the lowest performance with only 40% making a learning gain. That represents a 16% decrease from the previous year of 56%. Historical data has shown inconsistencies with students making adequate learning gains. Some of the previous contributing factors included consistent tracking of data throughout the year for the purpose of adjusting instructional practices and the inconsistent integration of high yielding instructional strategies (e.g. small group instruction, cooperative groups). Additionally, lack of regular reading practice through the use of A.R. by the students who make up this component, is also a contributing factor. We know that the gap in instruction from the spring of 2020 due to COVID has the potential to compound the challenges.

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

In 2019, ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the lowest performance with only 40% making a learning gain. That represents a 16% decrease from the previous year of 56%. Historical data has shown inconsistencies with students making adequate learning gains. Some of the previous contributing factors included consistent tracking of data throughout the year for the purpose of adjusting instructional practices and the inconsistent integration of high yielding instructional strategies (e.g. small group instruction, cooperative groups). Additionally, lack of regular reading practice through the use of A.R. by the students who make up this component, is also a contributing factor. We know that the gap in instruction from the spring of 2020 due to COVID has the potential to compound the challenges.

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.

In 2019, Wauchula Elementary School exceeded the state average in ELA Achievement, Math Achievement, and Math Lowest 25th Percentile. WES was slightly behind the state average in ELA Learning Gains (-5%), Math Learning Gains (-3%), and Science Achievement (-1%). However, once again the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile had the greatest gap when compared to the state average, with WES trailing the state by 13%. Some of the previous contributing factors included consistent tracking of data throughout the year for the purpose of adjusting instructional practices and the inconsistent integration of high yielding instructional strategies (e.g. small group instruction, cooperative groups). Additionally, lack of regular reading practice through the use of A.R. by the students who make up this component, is also a contributing factor. We know that the gap in instruction from the spring of 2020 due to COVID has the potential to compound the challenges.

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

The data component that demonstrated the most improvement was Math Lowest 25th Percentile with a 10% increase over the previous year, increasing from 44% to 54%, exceeding the state average by 3%. A contributing element to the increase in student performance was the implementation of small group skill instruction in fourth grade. An emphasis was placed on math skill remediation for the students identified in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile and tracking their performance throughout the year was a priority. The strategies implemented proved successful. However, the 54% making a learning gain in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile component represent a four year high, therefore, due to the inconsistency in performance in this component, it remains an area of concern.

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

This year has presented a new set of challenges for identifying at risk students using EWS. One major area of concern that is not on the surface evident is related to attendance. We are seeing groups of students having to miss school for longer periods of time (e.g. 10-14 days) due to COVID related issues, as well as a large group of students within the virtual platform (HILO) who are not consistently 'attending' daily check-ins. These data points are not easily tracked, thus compounding the concern. Regardless, we know that students are most at risk when there is a gap in direct instruction. When students fail to 'attend' school, vital instruction is missed creating gaps in learning and weakness in foundational skills and grade level standards.

A secondary concern is the number of students with failing grades in ELA or Math. A large number of these students are our HILO students who are failing due to incomplete or missing classwork. Some are also traditional students who have missed more than 10 days (excused or unexcused) and thus missing instructional time.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile is the area of highest priority for this school year. The 16% decrease from the previous year as well as the inconsistency in growth and performance over the past few years makes it the area of greatest concern.
2. Math Lowest 25th Percentile component is a secondary area of concern. Although a 10% increase was demonstrated from the previous year, historical data indicates it as an area of inconsistent growth and performance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:**

#1. Other specifically relating to ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Growth

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The performance of students in the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile decreased 16% in learning gains when compared to the previous year (from 56% to 40%). This performance is 13% below the state average. Additionally, historical data of the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile indicates inconsistency in performance over the past few years and appears to be an area of inconsistent growth.

Measurable Outcome: The learning gains performance of the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile will increase from 40% to 50%, a 10 percentage point increase.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mary Farr (mfarr@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement brain-based instructional strategies that have a target effective size of .40 and above throughout ELA instruction, as well as the integration of small group reading instruction in a more consistent manner.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Routinely implementing the brain-based instructional strategies that engage the brain during instruction will increase student engagement in instruction and increase recall of information presented. The integration of small group reading instruction will provide the necessary remediation of skills students have not mastered, building a stronger foundation for success in mastering grade level reading standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Due to lack of spring data from the previous year, we will identify students in the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile after the initial diagnostic assessment for iReady has been completed. The school and regularly monitor progress throughout the year. Disaggregate and discuss data every month in grade group meetings, including weekly Cold Reads, I-Ready lessons passed, and A.R. quizzes passed. (Farr / Bellflower)
2. Schoolwide professional development during the school will focus on high yield instructional strategies, as well as updates on new tools in iReady that help gear instructional planning toward the needs of the students. (Date: Pre-planning PD in August and ongoing) (Farr / Bellflower)
3. The integration of small group instruction that focuses on the needs of targeted students. (Farr)

Person Responsible Mary Farr (mfarr@hardee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Other specifically relating to Math Lowest Quartile Learning Growth

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Math Lowest 25th Percentile will be a secondary area of focus. In 2019, this component increased by 10% from the previous year (from 44% to 54% making growth) after judiciously implementing small group math instruction for 30 minutes daily for students identified in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile. Historical data indicates inconsistency in the performance of students in quartile group. Additionally, we know that the gap in instruction from the spring of 2020 due to COVID has the potential to compound the challenge.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students in the Math Lowest Quartile making learning gains will increase from 54% to 57%, a 3 percentage point increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Farr (mfarr@hardee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement brain-based instructional strategies that have a target effective size of .40 and above throughout Math instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Routinely implementing the 20 brain based instructional strategies that engage the brain during instruction will increase student engagement in instruction and increase recall of information presented.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Due to lack of spring data from the previous year, we will identify students in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile after the initial diagnostic assessment for iReady has been completed. The school and regularly monitor progress throughout the year. Disaggregate and discuss data every month in grade group meetings. (Farr / Bellflower)
2. Schoolwide professional development during the school will focus on high yield instructional strategies, as well as updates on new tools in iReady that help gear instructional planning toward the needs of the students. (Date: Pre-planning PD in August and ongoing) (Farr / Bellflower)

Person Responsible Mary Farr (mfarr@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

As indicated earlier, this year has presented a new set of challenges for identifying at risk students based upon attendance as a EWS indicator. We are seeing groups of students having to miss school for longer periods of time (e.g. 10-14 days) due to COVID related issues, as well as a large group of students within the virtual platform (HILO) who are not consistently 'attending' daily check-ins. These data points are not easily tracked, thus compounding the concern. Regardless, we know that students are most at risk when there is a gap in direct instruction. When students fail to 'attend' school, vital instruction is missed creating gaps in learning and weakness in foundational skills and grade level standards.

It is because of this that the leadership team has made it a talking point for each meeting. The team review current data and discusses relevant concerns (whether COVID or HILO related), then determines strategies that can be put in place to support those targeted at risk groups. These strategies are specific to the need of the group and adjusts as the data changes. Some supportive strategies the team has put in place includes the following: providing educational resources to bridge the learning gap while students are out for quarantine (both virtually and traditionally platforms), proactive parent communication, & parent conferences to address concerns.

The leadership team will continue to review current data trends and adjust the strategies as needed

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 WES we realize that creating a successful culture/environment is directly connected to the relationship between the various stakeholders. It is through this environment that we can positively impact student performance. It is with that in mind that the following items have been established:

1. Open House - This day occurs just before the opening of school and allows parents and students to meet assigned teachers. It is here that teachers can begin the foundation for a collaborative relationship with students and their families.
2. Parent Conference Nights - Midway through the first quarter, WES has set aside nights for each grade level to allow teachers and parents to meet for the purpose of reviewing a student's 'baseline data'. This meeting allows teachers to build an 'open line of communication' with our families.

3. Additional Parent Nights - As part of our Title I PFEP, WES has established events throughout the year to gain the involvement of our parents & families. These events will range from 'workshops' geared toward providing parents with information & resources on how to support their students to celebrations.

4. SAC Meetings - WES has built a School Advisory Council with stakeholder representatives reflective of the demographics of the school. This group will meet quarterly to review & provide input on various topics related to school improvement including the following: the SIP, the PFEP, survey results, & various school data.

5. Collaborative Structures - Faculty at WES incorporates the use of collaborative structures for the purpose of team and class building. These structures are adaptable to fit the curriculum needs of the classroom.

6. Communication - The school will utilize a variety of communication platforms to keep stakeholders informed on what is happening at WES. These include classroom & school newsletters, social media posts, school celebrations, and conference nights.

7. Student Clubs - Various student clubs will be offered as a way to provide students opportunities to explore areas of interests (e.g. art, STEM), as well as those that offer a way to nurture potential leadership capabilities within (e.g. student council & safety patrol).

8. End of Year Parent Surveys - Various surveys are used toward the end of the year to gather feedback from parents. This survey will provide the school some valuable information on how we can improve upon the service we provide to our students and families.

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: Other: ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Growth	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Math Lowest Quartile Learning Growth	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00