

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Wellington High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>29</b>

# Wellington High School

2101 GREENVIEW SHORES BLVD, Wellington, FL 33414

<https://welh.palmbeachschools.org>

## Demographics

**Principal: Cara Hayden**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/16/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (62%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/20/2021.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>29</b>

# Wellington High School

2101 GREENVIEW SHORES BLVD, Wellington, FL 33414

<https://welh.palmbeachschools.org>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>45%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>57%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>Grade</b>	A	A	A	A

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/20/2021.

## 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.**

The School District of Palm Beach County is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Wellington Community High School seeks to provide a safe environment conducive to developing lifelong learners and productive citizens who contribute to the community as a whole.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

The School District of Palm Beach County envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported and where all learners reach their highest potential in order to succeed in the global economy.

Students' learning needs are the primary focus of all decisions impacting the work of the school because each student is a valued individual with unique physical, social, emotional and intellectual needs.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hayden, Cara	Principal	Oversees personnel, academics, and student body to ensure access and equity to all programs, supports, and aides that could contribute to a student's success.
Calventorres, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Oversees personnel teaching 12th grade classes, oversees a dean for that grade level to ensure a restorative justice approach to discipline, monitor classroom instruction, and maintain effective two-way communication with all stakeholders, and monitors and facilitates PLCS,
Grant, Tonya	Assistant Principal	Oversees personnel teaching 11th grade classes, oversees a dean for that grade level to ensure a restorative justice approach to discipline, monitor classroom instruction, and maintain effective two-way communication with all stakeholders, and monitors and facilitates PLCS,
Kozlowski, Mike	Assistant Principal	Oversees personnel teaching 9th grade classes, oversees a dean for that grade level to ensure a restorative justice approach to discipline, monitor classroom instruction, and maintain effective two-way communication with all stakeholders, and monitors and facilitates PLCS,
Rejc, John	Assistant Principal	Oversees personnel teaching 10th grade classes, oversees a dean for that grade level to ensure a restorative justice approach to discipline, monitor classroom instruction, and maintain effective two-way communication with all stakeholders, and monitors and facilitates PLCS,
Moore, Eric	Assistant Principal	Oversees personnel teaching 11th grade classes, oversees a dean for that grade level to ensure a restorative justice approach to discipline, monitor classroom instruction, and maintain effective two-way communication with all stakeholders, and monitors and facilitates PLCS,
Krupa, James	Dean	Monitors and administers student discipline and tracks student attendance, academic performance, and graduation requirements for 12th grade.
Tanton, Lee	Dean	Monitors and administers student discipline and tracks student attendance, academic performance, and graduation requirements for 9th grade.
Stechschulte, Daniel	Dean	Monitors and administers student discipline and tracks student attendance, academic performance, and graduation requirements for 10th grade.
Kolshak, Kristina	Teacher, K-12	As Language Arts Department Chair for 9th and 10th grade, responsible for monitoring and guiding 9th and 10th grade Language Arts teachers to ensure all students are receiving equitable standards-based instruction.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mauney, Kent	Teacher, K-12	As Science Department Chair, responsible for monitoring and guiding Science teachers to ensure all students are receiving equitable standards-based instruction
Mucino, Salvador	Teacher, K-12	As Mathematics Department Chair, responsible for monitoring and guiding Mathematics teachers to ensure all students are receiving equitable standards-based instruction

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 1/16/2018, Cara Hayden

**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.*

1

**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.*

10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

162

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

2,656

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

16

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

21

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2021-22**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	730	698	614	616	2658
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	36	21	23	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	4	6	5	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	203	154	129	570
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	201	140	148	555
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	64	95	29	251
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	98	62	18	193
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	108	101	41	352
FY21 ELA Winter Diag Level 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	236	0	0	458

**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	71	179	131	116	497

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	36	21	23	108
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	64	81	37	236

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/27/2021

**2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	695	623	619	630	2567
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	25	21	26	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	66	42	59	215
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	135	112	101	422
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	152	123	121	447
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	72	52	59	244
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	36	4	86	179
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	163	0	0	322

**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	80	144	91	124	439

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	18

**2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	695	623	619	630	2567
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	25	21	26	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	66	42	59	215
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	135	112	101	422
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	152	123	121	447
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	72	52	59	244
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	36	4	86	179
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	163	0	0	322

**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	80	144	91	124	439

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	18

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				72%	57%	56%	72%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	51%	51%	58%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	43%	42%	53%	46%	44%
Math Achievement				64%	54%	51%	64%	54%	51%
Math Learning Gains				53%	45%	48%	55%	47%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	43%	45%	43%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				86%	73%	68%	82%	72%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				82%	74%	73%	79%	73%	71%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**  
**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
09	2021					
	2019	71%	56%	15%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	53%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	84%	69%	15%	67%	17%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	69%	10%	70%	9%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	53%	64%	-11%	61%	-8%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	64%	60%	4%	57%	7%

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

-Progress monitoring allows teachers and administrators to track students' academic progress or growth across the entire school year. Teachers use student performance data to continually evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching and make more informed instructional decisions. If the rate at which a particular student is learning seems insufficient, the teacher can adjust instruction. We use various reports to monitor and support student learning: USAs and Diagnostic assessments in the Fall, Winter and Spring as well as Reading plus Insight assessments.

-Unit Standardized Assessments (USAs) gives teachers data on how well the students have mastered the standard. Supports the monitoring of student learning and provides ongoing feedback that instructors can use to make adjustments to instruction to improve student learning..

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68.6%	61.7%	55.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60.2%	50.7%	46.5%
	Students With Disabilities	34.9%	27.7%	22.1%
	English Language Learners	27.8%	10.5%	5.3%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72.4%	60.7%	69.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64.4%	53.3%	61.3%
	Students With Disabilities	22.6%	29.2%	39.4%
	English Language Learners	11.1%	38.1%	43.5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	89.3%	91.2%	94.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	88.9%	89.0%	94.0%
	Students With Disabilities	80.0%	80.0%	86.7%
	English Language Learners	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76%	73%	69.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68.3%	63.6%	58.8%
	Students With Disabilities	42.4%	36.6%	33.3%
	English Language Learners	43.8%	17.6%	17.6%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54.3%	38.0%	36.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50.9%	30.9%	29.1%
	Students With Disabilities	24.1%	17.6%	14.8
	English Language Learners	50.0%	27.8	26.3%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	82.3%	77.1%	79.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76.9%	77.2%	73.3%
	Students With Disabilities	71.4%	60.9%	65.2%
	English Language Learners	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72.2	85.7	87.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	50.0	70.0	75.0
	Students With Disabilities	100.0	100.0	100.0
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	100.0	60.0	50.0
	Economically Disadvantaged		33.0	25.0
	Students With Disabilities		50.0	50.0
	English Language Learners		0.0	0.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11.5	15.8	12.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	5.3	14.6	9.8
	Students With Disabilities	12.5	13.6	9.1
	English Language Learners	0.0	21.4	14.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	61.3	55.2	41.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	56.8	57.1	39.5
	Students With Disabilities	78.3	65.2	43.5
	English Language Learners	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	76.5	89.1	87.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	67.9	84.8	82.8
	Students With Disabilities	52.9	88.5	88.2
	English Language Learners	33.3	45.5	58.3



Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	100.0	33.3	33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged		0.0	0.0
	Students With Disabilities		0.0	0.0
	English Language Learners		0.0	0.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0.0	16.0	20.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0.0	6.3	12.5
	Students With Disabilities	0.0	8.3	8.3
	English Language Learners	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	50.0	37.5	25.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.3	25.0	0.0
	Students With Disabilities	66.7	25.0	0.0
	English Language Learners	0.0	50.0	50.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Students With Disabilities	100.0	100.0	100.0
	English Language Learners	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

**Subgroup Data Review**

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	34	36	22	40	36	24	61	49		92	38
ELL	26	44	36	26	38	38	67	25		96	74
ASN	77	53		71	38		92	91		100	71
BLK	54	53	32	43	32	33	59	61		98	51
HSP	62	55	34	54	33	23	78	66		94	74

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	58	42	40	59	28		83	86		96	92
WHT	72	58	34	66	37	25	83	81		94	83
FRL	56	52	35	48	32	28	74	67		94	64
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	45	44	35	49	54	38	65	55		90	34
ELL	39	51	46	49	49	48	70	48		75	50
ASN	89	59		100	64		100	93		100	88
BLK	56	52	44	47	45	26	70	75		94	60
HSP	68	49	43	62	53	41	84	76		90	72
MUL	80	60	45	70	58		94	86		93	69
WHT	79	54	39	70	56	37	89	88		95	82
FRL	60	47	40	55	49	32	76	71		90	65
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	41	53	48	49	52	35	71	61		75	38
ELL	21	42	40	43	45	47	52	40		73	67
ASN	88	56		79	78		75	87		100	50
BLK	59	53	55	43	41	43	62	64		89	48
HSP	67	58	50	62	51	41	76	78		90	70
MUL	79	63		72	56		91	77		100	61
WHT	77	59	56	73	61	44	90	83		93	74
FRL	61	55	52	57	48	39	74	73		87	55

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	653
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	74
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

**Analysis**

**Data Analysis**

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

The emerging trends for subgroups indicate students with Disabilities and ELL subgroups are not making adequate progress in comparison to other subgroups. In ELA FY21, 21% males and 26% females SWD were proficient in comparison to the total achievement of 66% . These proficiency levels represent a decline from FY19 when SWD achieved 28% males and 39% females proficiency. The total achievement in FY 19 was 69% .FY21 data reflect a decline of 5% for total achievement. In our FY21 ELL subgroup, the proficiency rates are down in comparison to FY 19 where 13% Male and 22% female students for a total of 35% were proficient. In FY 21, 5% of our ELL subgroup was proficient. Both proficiency rates are significantly lower than the total achievement rate of 65% in FY21.

The same trends emerged in our Math data. Both ELL and SWD subgroups lagged behind other subgroups. SWD had 22% Male and 29% Female proficiency for a total rate of 51%. ELL students had 14% Male and 15% Female for a proficiency rate of 29%.These rates are a decline from FY19 rates were SWD 27% males and 29% female for a total of 56%. ELL students reported 23% male and 37% female for a total of 60%.

We also noticed a significant decrease in Math learning gains. In comparing SY19 vs SY 21 we experience a 19 percent decrease from 53% to 34%. Our lowest 25% also declined by 10% with 26% SY 21 vs 36% in SY 19.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Based on the most recent data trends our focus will be on increasing learning gains for our low 25% including our ELL and SWD subgroups in both ELA and Math. In all data points; USAs, Diagnostics and State Assessments, in the ELL and SWD subgroups the learning achievement gap continues to widen.

In FY 21, our ELA achievement level was 65%. Our ELA low 25% learning gains was 34%. However our ELL subgroup reported 5% and SWD reported 47% achievement. The data represents a difference of 60% for our ELL subgroup and 15% for SWD subgroup.

In FY 21, our Math achievement level was 54%. Our low 25% was 26%. However our ELL subgroup

reported 30% and SWD reported 51%. The data indicates a difference of 24% for ELL students and 3% for SWD students.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

The most significant contributing factor was the inability to implement targeted tutorials which would have started at the beginning of the 2nd semester during the school day . Another contributing factor was the inability to implement afterschool tutorials and workshops in preparation for the state assessment. Also with many students choosing virtual learning, implementing ELL and SWD strategies were a challenge.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA Gains at 55%. This was a 3% gain from 52% in FY19.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The most significant contributing factor was continued PLCs where data from FSQs and USAs were analyzed to create an action plan for reteaching deficient skills. Also the implementation of PBPA re-writes in all ELA classes after teachers provided constructive feedback.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

To accelerate learning, the following strategies will be implemented:

- \*After school & Saturday Writing Bootcamps
- \*PLC Work in all subjects
- \* Masterboard Scheduling (DBL Algebra)
- \*All regular 10th grade ELA students will take AICE GP
- \*Targeted Small group tutorials
- \*Low 25% pull outs in 2nd semester

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

The professional learning opportunities at the school to support lead teachers are:

1. PLC leaders
2. School-wide writing strategies
3. ELL/SWD Instructional Strategies

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

To ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond we will continue to create double blocks for Algebra 1. Also, we will schedule all regular 10th grade ELA students in AICE GP with support through Reading or ESE Support Facilitators. We will continue to administer the District's FSQs and USAs to monitor incremental student progress and create targeted small group tutorials during the school day and after school tutorials.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

If we focus on standards-based instruction that is strengthened through effective and consistent PLCs to increase learning gains for our low 25% in Math, then we will increase student achievement in all subgroups.  
 The results of our Math learning gains and low 25% were our lowest performing categories when comparing Math scores from FY 19 to FY 21. The Math learning gains decreased by 19 points , and low 25% decreased by 10 points.  
 The results from the District USAs also indicated a steady decline from Fall, Winter to Spring. In 9th grade, the data reflects a decline from fall to spring of 12.6%. In 10th grade, the data shows a decline from fall to spring of 18.1%. In 11th grade, the data shows a decline of 50% from fall to Spring.

**Measurable Outcome:**

By FY 22, we will increase the overall percentage of students making learning gains in Math by 16 % bringing us up to 50%. We will also increase the percentage of low 25% learning gains by 19 % bringing us up to 45%

**Monitoring:**

Math teachers will administer the District USA and Diagnostic assessments (fall, winter and spring) in accordance to the schedule in Blender. Teachers will analyze data to drive instruction providing remediation to students in need.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Salvador Mucino (salvador.mucino@palmbeachschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

PLC Work - Data Driven Standards-based instruction is an educational approach that relies on information to inform teaching and learning. The idea refers to a method teachers use to improve instruction by looking at the information they have about their students to determine strengths and weaknesses of individual students or whole class which dictates instruction.  
 We also have double blocked all students in Algebra 1 and Liberal Arts to provide for additional support. Students who are not successful in Algebra 1 at the beginning of the 2nd semester, will be removed from Algebra1 and be placed in Intensive Math. This will give students another year to gain the Algebra 1 skills and obtain a math credit towards the 4 required credits needed to for graduation. We will also implement targeted tutorials during the school day. These targeted groups will be created after the Winter Diagnostic assessment. Students predicted to score below a level 3 will be pulled for targeted instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

"Scoreboard" in Performance matters platform gives us real-time insight into whether or not incremental progress is being made toward overall goals. PLC Work; backward design, common lesson planning will align teachers, resources and group effort toward overall achievement goals. Targeted Tutorials ensure students receive content support beyond the school day.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Monitoring for the strategies below will occur through lesson plan reviews, student data analysis, admin/teacher data chats, and/or walkthroughs/instructional reviews.  
 Central "Scoreboard" for aggregating data indicators leading toward overall goal/outcome; make an active spreadsheet/database keeping class USA/FSQ data. (Principal and all APs).  
 PLC Work; data-driven instruction, backward design planning, group efforts toward a common goal. (Mucino and all grade-level APs).  
 PD Item Specs and Item Analysis (Through PLCs); design assessments and lesson activities using state-provided item specs to further align instruction with State Standards. (All grade?level APs)  
 Masterboard Scheduling (Dbl Block); schedule all Algebra 1 students into a "double-block" of

Algebra and Liberal Arts Math. (Grade-level AP's). FT21 students that were low performers in ALG 1 and are scheduled to take the ALG 1 EOC are in a section of Alg 1 for only 10th graders who needed additional support.

Targeted Tutorials; invitation-only small-group tutorials with incentives targeting our bottom 25% in Math(Grade-level AP's)

Low 25% Pull-Outs 2nd Semester; pull students from non-academic electives twice a week to receive further Algebra 1 instruction through small groups, specifically the bottom 25% students. (Ms. Hayden, Mr. Kozlowski, Mucino)

Hired Graduation Coach who will be working primarily with our lowest 10% in 11th and 12th grades.

**Person Responsible** Mike Kozlowski (mike.kozlowski@palmbeachschools.org)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

If we focus on standards-based instruction that is strengthened through effective and consistent PLCs to increase learning gains in low 25% in ELA/Reading, then we will increase student achievement in all subgroups. Our focus is to ensure progress towards student achievement and low 25% in ELA/Reading as we experienced a decline of 4% in total proficiency. In FY 19 the proficiency rate was 69% in comparison to 65% in FY21. Contributing to this decline was the 5% proficiency in our ELL subgroup and 47% proficiency in SWD subgroup.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our ELA bottom 25% Learning Gains dropped from 42% in FY 19 to 34% in FY 21. PLC's were focused on Instructional practice and standards-aligned instruction to address the gap of instruction as some experienced teachers retired and we searched for certified instructors. The ELL population was impacted by this interruption of instruction. Additional support was added to the department to support our ELL subgroup including an ESOL School Counselor. This helps our students have an advocate to meet their specific diverse needs.

FY22 the focus is to:  
 Increase Achievement by 9 points from 66 to 75%  
 Increase Learning Gains by 10 points from 55% to 65%  
 Increase Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% by 21 points from 34% to 55%

**Measurable Outcome:**

By FY 22, we will increase the overall percentage of students making learning gains in ELA/Reading by 10 % bringing us up to 65%. We will also increase the percentage of low 25% learning gains by 21% bringing us up to 55%.

**Monitoring:**

In FY21 we monitored by common assessments through FSQ's, USA's, and winter diagnostics .AICE teachers began to incorporate state standards in their classrooms. For FY 22 we will continue to monitor possible outcomes through common assessments by diagnostics and the USA's.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kristina Kolshak (kristina.kolshak@palmbeachschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Central "Scoreboard" for aggregating data indicators leading toward overall goal/outcome. This allows you to track to compare individual students' scores from one assessment to identify trends and patterns. Writing Bootcamps is a tutorial with a writing focus on improvement. Students are given exemplars for them to model writing for improvement. PLC Work (Standards-Based Backwards Design Lesson Planning), teachers collaborate on lesson planning with teachers that teach the same subject and focus on standards-based design to follow district scope and sequence. PBPA Re-writes- Students take their PBPA assessment and are allowed to rewrite after the teacher provides specific feedback.  
 Targeted Tutorials for students that are predicted to score below a 3 on the Central "Scoreboard" for aggregating data indicators leading toward overall goal/outcome. This allows you to track to compare individual students' scores from one assessment to identify trends and patterns.  
 Writing Bootcamps is a tutorial with a writing focus on improvement. Students are given exemplars for them to model writing for improvement.  
 PLC Work (Standards-Based Backwards Design Lesson Planning), teachers collaborate on lesson planning with teachers that teach the same subject and

focus on standards-based design to follow district scope and sequence.  
 PBPA Re-writes- Students take their PBPA assessment and are allowed to rewrite after the teacher provides specific feedback.  
 Targeted Tutorials for students that are predicted to score below a 3 on the Central "Scoreboard" for aggregating data indicators leading toward overall goal/outcome; this tool gives us real-time insight into whether or not incremental progress is being made toward our overall goal.  
 Writing Bootcamps; data indicates that students who score a 7 or better on the writing portion of the ELA FSA are extremely likely to earn a 3 or higher and these boot camps will be used to remediate selected students.  
 PBPA Re-writes; this strategy assists and models the process students can take to earn a 7 on the ELA writing subsection of the FSA. PLC Work; backward design common lesson planning will align teachers, resources, and group efforts toward our overall achievement goals. Targeted Tutorials; ensure students receive content support beyond the school day. Low 25% Pull-Outs 2nd Semester; extra instruction to students needing remediation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

Monitoring for the strategies below will occur through: lesson plan reviews, student data analysis, admin/teacher data chats, and/or walkthroughs/instructional reviews.  
 Central "Scoreboard" for aggregating data indicators leading toward overall goal/outcome; make an active spreadsheet/database keeping class USA/FSQ data. (Principal and all APs)  
 Writing Bootcamps; select "bubble" (6 on PY writing FSA) students to come in after school leading up to the FSA. (Grade level AP's).  
 PLC Work; data-driven instruction, backward design planning, group efforts toward a common goal. (All grade-level APs).  
 All 10th graders scoring a level 2 in FY21 will be placed a double block of English ( AICE General Papers paired with a Reading teacher for additional support).  
 PBPA Re-writes; ELA teachers will build off PBPA's and model essay construction through a constant revision process. (ELA teachers, Mrs. Rigolo, Mrs. Shatskin, All APs).  
 PD Item Specs and Item Analysis (Through PLCs); design assessments and lesson activities using state-provided item specs to further align instruction with State Standards. (All grade level APs).  
 Targeted Tutorials; invitation-only small-group tutorials with incentives targeting our bottom 25% in ELA (Ms. Shatskin Grade Level AP's)

**Person Responsible** Cara Hayden (cara.hayden@palmbeachschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**According to the school safety dashboard, Wellington High school scored a high ranking coming in at 353 out of 505 high schools statewide. We also ranked 20 out of the 28 high schools in the county. In reports per 100 students, we reported 3.9 incidents per 100 which is higher than the states rate of 3.3 incidents per 100 students. The incidents of crime, violence and disruption behaviors have been organized into three categories: Violent incidents, property incidents, and drug/public order incidents. Of the three categories, We ranked "Very High" in property incidents at 415 out of 505 statewide, 22 out of 28 county wide and .12 per 100 students. The specific incidents were breaking and entering/burglary, larceny, theft, or motor vehicle and vandalism. In Drug/public order incident category, we ranked "High" at 390 out of 505 statewide, 22 out of 28 county wide, and 3.01 per 100 students. the specific incidents were tobacco, drug use or possession, except alcohol, other major offenses, disruption on campus and weapons possession. In violent incidents category, we ranked "Middle" at 228 out of 505 statewide, 10 out of 28 countywide and .79 per 100 students. The specific incidents were fighting, physical attack, bullying, battery and harassment. Our suspension reports ranked "middle" with a total of 269 suspensions; 162 in school and 98 out of school.**

To support our students and reduce our incident reports, we have increased supervision around campus by assigning zones to our mobile staff. This will allow for supervision during the school day throughout the entire campus. Administrators will be more visible on campus as each administrator will roam the campus at least one period of the day providing additional supervision and presence. We will promote our SWPB initiative and encourage teachers and staff to issue points through the K-12 hero conductor. In addition, we will begin the MTISS process sooner than later to implement interventions as soon as possible. We will foster appropriate social emotional skills through our monthly SEL lessons and daily bell ringer lessons. We will provide students an opportunity go gain knowledge on the harmful effects of using tobacco through our District sponsored ATOD class. Administration will also assign appropriate lessons from Suite 360 to reteach expectations when assigning consequences for behavior infractions.

#### **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.**

Our SWPB team has developed a strong presence in our building. We have been recognized as a Model School for the past 2 years. The team has established norms that are in alignment with the school's mission and have been shared and embraced by staff and students. The "Wellington Way" is posted in multiple languages around the campus and in classrooms. The expectations are frequently reviewed and referenced during grade level discipline assemblies. Students who are observed following the "Wellington Way" by their teachers or staff, are nominated and recognized by the SWPB Team. When students are recognized by the team, they receive various rewards and gift cards from local businesses. The team also recognizes students in the school's news letter.

This year we have expanded opportunities for students to be recognized for following "The Wellington Way" with a new initiative called "Hero k-12". This app gives teachers an opportunity to immediately award points to students who are going above and beyond in exhibiting the school wide expectations. As students accumulate points, they can redeem them at the school store for various items.

In addition to individual recognition, we have established leadership clubs to recognize and give voice to students of all cultural, religion and social backgrounds. Principal Hayden meets with club leaders once a month to assist them in collaborating for school activities and discuss student issues and concerns.

Suite 360, a curriculum the District selected to implement the eight hour mandated instruction related to youth and mental health awareness. Through the suite 360, students participate in lessons on the following topics: Mental health conditions, Supporting someone with Mental Health, Prevention of Substance Misuse, etc.

After each quarter there is an honor roll assembly to recognize students for their academic excellence. The SEL lessons are scheduled monthly during 4th period. Teachers also implement SEL lessons during their daily instruction as a bell ringer.

In addition, as stipulated within Florida Statute & Policy 2.09 Wellington High ensures all students receive equal access to the pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 Instruction will also be infused as applicable to appropriate grade levels including but not limited to:

(a) History of the Holocaust, the systematic, planned annihilation of European Jews and other groups by Nazi Germany, a watershed event in the history of humanity, to be taught in a manner that leads to an investigation of human behavior, an understanding of the ramifications of prejudice, racism, and stereotyping, and an examination of what it means to be a responsible and respectful person, the purposes of encouraging tolerance of diversity in a pluralistic society and for nurturing and protecting democratic values and institutions, including the policy, definition, and historical and current examples of anti-Semitism, as described in s. 1000.05(7), and the prevention of anti-Semitism. The second week in November shall be designated as "Holocaust Education Week".

(b) History of African and African Americans including the history of African peoples before the political conflicts that led to the development of slavery, the passage to America, the enslavement experience, abolition, and the contributions of African Americans to society.

(c) Women's Contribution

(d) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

These concepts are introduced as stand-alone and may also be integrated into other core subjects. Our goal is for our students to learn the content and curriculum taught through Florida State Statute 1003.42 to ensure inclusiveness for all.

Teachers follow the scope and sequence as outlined on the Palm Beach County curriculum resource blender, This ensures that teachers have a concrete timeline as well as the resources to provide quality instruction on the mandated curriculum. Additionally, topics are often addressed in greater depth through the school counselor during her instruction on the wheel.

**Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

Teachers: incorporate the SWPB initiatives and the K-12 Hero to promote social, emotional and behavioral academics. They also sponsor various clubs which gives them an opportunity to develop relationships with students.

Principal: Promote collaboration among the various clubs/groups to plan school wide events and resolve issues and concerns. She also promotes collaboration among staff members through PLCs, Leadership meetings and surveys.

Business Partners: Provide incentives for students following the Wellington Way and etc.

Wellington Wellness counselors: Support the behavioral and mental health of students through individual counseling and organizing school wide educational opportunities through suite 360.

Watch D.O.G.S: an organized group of male parents who volunteer and assist in providing additional supervision during the school day.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2191 - Wellington High School	School Improvement Funds	2656.0	\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Funds will be utilized for afterschool tutorials, targeted tutorials, Saturday tutorials, supplies and student incentives.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2191 - Wellington High School	School Improvement Funds	2656.0	\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Funds will be used for after school tutorials, targeted tutorials, Saturday tutorials, classroom supplies and student incentives.</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$10,000.00</b>