

Alachua County Public Schools

Kimball Wiles Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Kimball Wiles Elementary School

4601 SW 75TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32608

<https://www.sbac.edu/wiles>

Demographics

Principal: Katherine Munn

Start Date for this Principal: 9/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
2020-21 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Alachua County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Kimball Wiles Elementary School

4601 SW 75TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32608

<https://www.sbac.edu/wiles>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

District: We are committed to the Success of Every Student!

School: The mission of Kimball Wiles Elementary School is to provide each student with the best opportunity to learn and thrive each day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

District: We will graduate students who have the knowledge, skill, and personal character to be lifelong learners and independent thinkers. Our graduates will excel in their chosen careers and be productive and contributing members of the global community.

School: Through a unified effort, Kimball Wiles will provide a cooperative, secure and innovative environment in which all individuals will reach their full potential.

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
Munn, Katherine	Principal	Provides leadership and promotes the school's vision. Ensures that faculty and staff are trained in all aspects of student learning and performance.
Haukland, Edward	Assistant Principal	Provides guidance to classroom teachers on development of appropriate instructional strategies for individual students. Provides research based curriculum resources for classroom use. Implements state, district, and school level data collection and assists in data analysis. Assists with the design and implementation of intervention plans.
Cox, Tracy	Instructional Coach	Collects student data and aids in the analysis of classroom and student performances. Provides resources to teachers regarding best practices for instruction. Maintains records for Title 1. Provides training for Title 1, ESE, and Intervention teachers.
Polvere, Stacey	Dean	Develops and implements school-wide Student Behavior including Functional Behavior Assessments and Behavior Improvement Plans. Maintains records of behavior issues and resolutions.
Kranzler, Theresa	School Counselor	Monitors implementation of IEPs and 504 plans. Provides guidance to students needing assistance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 9/1/2018, Katherine Munn

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.*

34

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

848

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

4

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

4

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	148	131	142	142	127	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	833
Attendance below 90 percent	5	12	16	20	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	6	2	8	5	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	2	6	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	32	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	32	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	63	31	28	39	43	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	258

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	26	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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

Monday 9/20/2021

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	120	133	136	113	144	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	762
Attendance below 90 percent	3	9	16	20	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	120	133	136	113	144	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	762
Attendance below 90 percent	3	9	16	20	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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%	59%	57%	68%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	57%	58%	45%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	49%	53%	35%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				72%	60%	63%	70%	64%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	61%	62%	57%	58%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	49%	51%	30%	45%	47%
Science Achievement				65%	57%	53%	64%	55%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	55%	17%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	55%	10%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	70%	58%	12%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	60%	17%	64%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	64%	55%	9%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

AIMS quarterly assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75	82	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	72	74	78
	Students With Disabilities	60	60	60
	English Language Learners	64	68	72
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75	89	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	75	82	74
	Students With Disabilities	60	65	60
	English Language Learners	72	80	70
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63	64	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	60	60
	Students With Disabilities	60	60	60
	English Language Learners	62	64	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72	70	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	60	65
	Students With Disabilities	60	60	60
	English Language Learners	68	65	72

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60	64	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	60	60
	Students With Disabilities	50	52	53
	English Language Learners	60	60	65
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60	58	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	54	72
	Students With Disabilities	52	50	62
	English Language Learners	60	54	75
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60	58	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	55	58
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	54
	English Language Learners	58	53	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	66	58	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	56	54
	Students With Disabilities	50	52	50
	English Language Learners	62	58	54

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	50	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	45	50
	Students With Disabilities	40	40	48
	English Language Learners	42	48	54
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54	56	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	54	60
	Students With Disabilities	48	50	55
	English Language Learners	52	54	62
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	55	57
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	52	50	55
	Students With Disabilities	45	48	45
	English Language Learners	52	50	52
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	55	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	50	55

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	33	26	23	38	50	40	31				
ELL	55	23		70	77		53				
ASN	76	50		86	79		88				
BLK	37	27	30	32	43	45	13				
HSP	62	50		63	68	60	61				
MUL	61	69		72	69		79				
WHT	79	63		79	82		80				
FRL	44	45	45	42	58	48	40				
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	38	41		41	50	42					
ELL	75	64		79	81						

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
ASN	92	76		95	83		83				
BLK	40	43	35	39	56	45	27				
HSP	71	62		65	55	46	33				
MUL	86	100		90	81						
WHT	80	70	48	80	64	37	84				
FRL	54	55	35	48	51	40	36				
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	38	39	29	31	29	20	29				
ELL	38	69		63	77						
ASN	87	76		98	93		88				
BLK	42	36	27	35	36	19	27				
HSP	67	47	55	69	56		67				
MUL	72	37		77	58		64				
WHT	74	44	45	78	58	53	76				
FRL	55	38	31	53	45	23	47				

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	466
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	74
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	77
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data 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 area needing the most attention is the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math. All school grade components showed an increase over the previous year, however the lowest quartile remained below the district and state average, even though both components showed growth. One contributing factor for such performance could be the lack of consistent resources being used in tutoring, Title 1, and in-class small group instruction. With the continuation of the SIPPS program, we hope to reduce the impact of such a factor.

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

Grades 3-5 recorded the lowest rates of improvement, as measured by AIMS data and reiterated by state assessments.

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

It would appear that as the rigor increased through the grade levels, our response was not adequate. We have implemented more resources (title 1, tutoring, etc.) towards these grade levels as well as instituted an FSA Boot Camp for grades 3-5 in the Spring of this year.

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

Grades 1-2 showed significant improvements towards achieving standard understanding compared with all other grades levels.

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

Implementation of the SIPPS program as well as title one aides attending to these grade levels..

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

This year UFLI will be an integral strategy to assist struggling students in Reading.

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.

UFLI already has provided trainings at the district level and we will continue to learn UFLI strategies throughout the year.

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

Once fully established, the UFLI curriculum will be self-sustainable and will include teacher-trainers at the school level.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the rates of achievement in the lower quartile, Wiles will continue to provide training in UDL instructional practices to assist teachers in gaining a better understanding of how to reach students of all abilities with an emphasis on students who are struggling academically.
Measurable Outcome:	To coincide with district goals, Wiles will: Increase student achievement of the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math by at least 3 percentage points; and Reduce the achievement gap in all curricular areas by at least 3 percentage points in ELA and Math
Monitoring:	1. UDL Training provided to specific teachers to become trainers for remainder of staff. 2. Faculty UDL overview provided to all staff. 3. Trainers will provide specific training to individual grade levels. 4. Admin will monitor compliance and participation in UDL.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Munn (munnnkl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	UDL training will be provided as part of Wiles' Professional Development opportunities given throughout the year. Multiple staff meetings will coincide with support from administration as well as compliance monitoring at defined intervals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"UDL is based on foundational research within the neurosciences, developmental psychology, and learning differences (Rose & Gravel, 2010). This research has suggested that to accomplish effective instructional planning, teachers should consider how to integrate three principles into their instruction and assessment practices that are based on three interrelated types of brain networks (i.e., recognition, strategic, and affective networks). Considering teaching and learning through these three brain networks provides a framework for planning instruction for diverse learners (T. E. Hall, Meyer, & Rose, 2012)." Israel, Maya, et al. "Universal Design for Learning: Recommendations for Teacher Preparation and Professional Development." Innovation Configuration, IC-7, June 2014, http://cedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/IC-7_FINAL_08-27-14.pdf

Action Steps to Implement

1. UDL Training provided to specific teachers to become trainers for remainder of staff.
2. Faculty UDL overview provided to all staff.
3. Trainers will provide specific training to individual grade levels.
4. Admin will monitor compliance and participation in UDL.

Person Responsible Katherine Munn (munnnkl@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. Other specifically relating to Student Achievement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By implementing an FSA Boot Camp, students will have opportunities after school to participate in learning activities that focus on strategies and specific standards that will support student performance on standardized assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	As measured by FSA data, students in the Lower Quartile will show a year's growth as well as achieve a level 3 on the FSA.
Monitoring:	IIC will design activities using teacher input and monitor implementation along with administration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Cox (coxtm@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Numerous cooperative learning strategies will be implemented as students rotate throughout learning experiences that focus on FSA achievement and performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students in the lower quartile will benefit from additional opportunities for learning outside the normal school day and will receive differentiated instruction as well as UDL created lessons.

Action Steps to Implement

IIC will design activities using teacher input and monitor implementation along with administration.

Person Responsible Tracy Cox (coxtm@gm.sbac.edu)

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.

Wiles is below the state average in discipline related events. This is a result of proactive approaches to student behavior pertaining to Positive Behavior Intervention Support systems (PBIS). Behavior check sheets, planned positive interactions with adults on campus, and guidance counselor interventions are a few of the strategies put in place to assist students. Monitoring of behavior will happen through administration observations and scheduled meetings with the PBIS team.

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.

Wiles has a community of caring individuals who work to create an environment where every student is successful. The PTA has numerous outreach programs which emphasize diversity and support instructional integrity. From the Diversity committee to the Teacher Mini-grant support system, Wiles PTA encourages community involvement. Wiles also works with community leaders and its members through the School Advisory Council. This group meets regularly to discuss student achievement and community involvement. In addition, Mrs. Munn, the school principal, communicates through her weekly newsletters and phone-home messages where she emphasizes school readiness and academic success behaviors for parents and their students.

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

Katherine Munn-School Leader. Establish and support school culture. Nurture School climate and support instruction.

Ed Haukland-Assistant Principal. Support school leadership.

Theresa Kranzler-Guidance Counselor. Support student Mental Health through district initiatives.

Montana Sewell-Guidance Counselor. Support student Mental Health through district initiatives.

Stacy Polvere-BRT. Support school-wide behavior management system. Establish, maintain, and support Positive behavior Instructional support system (PBIS).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$221.70
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	520-Textbooks	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$221.70
			Notes: By Continuing the UDL training(incorporating ICEL) for our staff, the training will provide instructional practices, teachers will gain a better understanding of how to reach students of all abilities with an emphasis on students who are struggling academically. To coincide with the district goals, Wiles will increase student achievement of the lowest quartile in both ELA and Math by at least 3 percentage points. Following the Alachua County			

			<i>Instructional Framework, teachers will be expected to have UDL principles within their lesson plans and follow the ICEL protocol when reviewing student progress and lesson planning.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Student Achievement				\$20,456.17
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$3,995.00
			<i>Notes: READY FLORIDA Digital Toolkit for ELA grades 2-5. School site License Teacher Toolbox 700+ students Supplement to improve the reading achievement of Tier 1, Tier 2, and bubble students who are eligible for Title 1. Materials will be useful in closing the achievement gap of our lower performing students.</i>			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$2,601.17
			<i>Notes: READY FLORIDA ELA Workbooks for grades 2-5. Books Supplement to improve the reading achievement of Tier 1, Tier 2, and bubble students who are eligible for Title 1. Materials will be useful in closing the achievement gap of our lower performing students.</i>			
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$7,140.00
			<i>Notes: Reading and Math After School tutoring services. EDI to improve academic achievement for Tier 2-3 students. 5 Teachers TBD and 1 IIC to Facilitate 34 EDI Sessions plus 8.5 hour for planning at a Cost of \$1190.00 each</i>			
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	0501 - Kimball Wiles Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$6,720.00
			<i>Notes: 42 teachers for 2 after school sessions of FSA Boot Camp to improve academic achievement for Tier 2-3 students taking the end of year assessment..</i>			
Total:						\$20,677.87