

Marion County Public Schools

Ward Highlands 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Ward Highlands Elementary School

537 SE 36TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Treasa Buck

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2021

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)	98%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 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 Marion 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Ward Highlands Elementary School

537 SE 36TH AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

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	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

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 Marion 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.

Ward-Highlands Elementary School seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success through developmentally appropriate instruction that allows for individual differences and learning styles. Our school promotes a safe, orderly, caring, and supportive environment. Each student's self-esteem is fostered by positive relationships with students and staff. We strive to have our parents, teachers, and community members actively involved in our students' learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ward-Highlands Elementary School is a place where all students can learn; academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere. Teachers and staff work tirelessly to promote a positive school environment and raise student performance. Our goal is to work in a partnership with our parents and community to create an environment where students are empowered to discover their strengths and to achieve their maximum potential. Our entire school community shares the belief that all children can and will learn.

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
Buck, Treasa	Principal	Treasa Buck is the instructional leader for Ward-Highlands Elementary. She works with all stakeholders to provide a successful learning environment for all students. Mrs. Buck provides resources to all stakeholders in order to improve success for all students.
Smiley, Carmen	Assistant Principal	Carmen Smiley is responsible for providing teachers with the resources needed to instruct students. Dr. Smiley works with the guidance department and ESE department to monitor data and create individual learning plans for students not being successful.
Altobello, Kristin	School Counselor	Kristin Altobello works with our Social Emotional Learning program for grades 3-5. She provides professional development and strategies to our teachers and paraprofessionals on positively working with students. Mrs. Altobello also monitors attendance and works closely with social services to provide guidance to our families with a high rate of absences.
Woelfel, Kelly	School Counselor	Kelly Woelfel works with our Social Emotional Learning program for grades VPK-2. She provides professional development and strategies to our teachers and paraprofessionals on positively working with students. Mrs. Woelfel also monitors attendance and works closely with social services to provide guidance to our families with a high rate of absences.
Cook, Tracy	Dean	Tracy Cook focuses on developing a positive school culture through modeling expectations across the campus. She works with students who need additional support in the area of behavior within our general education population as well as our self-contained population. Mrs. Cook provides monthly professional development to the staff on classroom engagement and management.
Walden, Jessica	Reading Coach	Jessica Walden focuses on reading and writing within all grade levels. She models instruction and provides professional development in the areas of reading and writing. Based on data Mrs. Walden will provide additional support to teachers and paras in order for students to be successful.
Miller, Karly	Math Coach	Karly Miller focuses on math and science within all grade levels. She models instruction and provides professional development in the areas of math and science. Based on data, Mrs. Miller will provide additional support to teachers and paras in order for students to be successful.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/26/2021, Treasa Buck

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.*

11

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.*

26

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

910

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

0

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

0

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	118	133	129	131	153	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	789
Attendance below 90 percent	44	33	48	35	50	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	246
One or more suspensions	4	2	5	4	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	14	34	35	14	23	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
Course failure in Math	18	25	28	16	30	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	1	4	3	0	0	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	17	27	33	19	33	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Wednesday 6/30/2021

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	118	137	127	136	154	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	1	30	20	25	27	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	8	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	1	8	10	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	1	6	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	18	20	35	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	1	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	118	137	127	136	154	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	1	30	20	25	27	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	8	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	1	8	10	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	1	6	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	18	20	35	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	1	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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				55%	47%	57%	54%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	56%	58%	49%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	52%	53%	46%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	51%	63%	61%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	58%	62%	55%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	49%	51%	43%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	47%	53%	60%	51%	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	41%	44%	-3%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	49%	13%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	45%	12%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	45%	16%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	44%	7%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Mathematics, Grades 1-5: I Ready Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34 / 28%	40 / 31%	72 / 55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 19%	19 / 24%	36 / 43%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 13%	1 / 6%	2 / 12%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24 / 20%	28 / 22%	61 / 47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 / 16%	12 / 15%	30 / 37%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	1 / 6%	3 / 19%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42 / 33%	42 / 32%	63 / 48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21 / 29%	20 / 27%	33 / 43%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 4%	1 / 4%	5 / 25%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18 / 14%	19 / 15%	51 / 40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 13%	8 / 11%	25 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 4%	2 / 8%	6 / 27%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70 / 56%	45 / 35%	68 / 53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33 / 48%	22 / 31%	33 / 47%
	Students With Disabilities	5 / 19%	2 / 7%	4 / 15%
	English Language Learners	1 / 33%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12 / 10%	18 / 14%	20 / 49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 6%	9 / 13%	7 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 10%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43 / 30%	41 / 28%	54 / 44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17 / 22%	18 / 21%	25 / 37%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 8%	4 / 17%	6 / 26%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23 / 16%	23 / 15%	67 / 48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 13%	9 / 11%	31 / 39%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 4%	2 / 7%	8 / 36%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24 / 21%	14 / 12%	5 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 17%	2 / 3%	2 / 22%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	0 / 0%	
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23 / 20%	19 / 16%	7 / 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 16%	6 / 10%	1 / 11%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	1 / 6%	
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64 / 58%	57 / 48%	47 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27 / 48%	21 / 34%	15 / 28%
	Students With Disabilities	8 / 47%	6 / 32%	5 / 26%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 14%	1 / 17%

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	27	42	33	38	48	42	21				
ELL	35			41							
BLK	23	45	36	39	47		25				
HSP	52	53		64	59		44				
MUL	44			28							
WHT	66	65	42	70	58	47	53				
FRL	47	52	31	52	48	31	35				
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	15	48	53	32	61	74	21				
ELL	56	86		61	79						
BLK	25	60	54	38	67	69	17				

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
HSP	50	71		54	64		40				
MUL	62	72		46	67		100				
WHT	61	65	58	65	67	58	57				
FRL	44	59	53	53	63	63	41				
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	19	35	39	41	52	48	30				
ELL	38			46							
BLK	25	49	67	36	57	48	26				
HSP	53	52		58	42		79				
MUL	64	50		55	50						
WHT	59	47	41	67	57	47	67				
FRL	47	48	45	54	53	37	51				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	415
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
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	56
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	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	57
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	43
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?

When analyzing multiple sources of data Ward-Highlands data shows a positive growth in ELA achievement. ELA achievement over the last 3 FSA assessments shows a growth from 54% to 55% to 57% in 2021. Analyzing FSA math data over the last 3 assessments shows a fluctuation in achievement but remains higher than other subjects. Science FSA data shows a downward trend from 2018 achievement at 60% to 2021 achievement at 45%.

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

The 3 areas that show the greatest need for improvement include learning gains for the bottom quartile, ELA achievement for students with disabilities, and science achievement. Ward-Highlands 2021 iReady data for ELA shows little to no growth in achievement for the students with disabilities. Achievement for SWD consistently stays below 20% in ELA according to iReady and FSA data. Science achievement has decreased from 2018 at 60% to 45% in 2021.

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

According to the 2021 5th grade ELA FSA data 45% of the bottom quartile is SWD and of that percentage 30% spend more than 70% of their day in a direct instruction classroom. According to the 2021 4th grade ELA FSA data 41% of the bottom quartile is SWD and of that percentage 35% spend more than 70% of their day in a direct instruction classroom. Ward-Highlands action steps need to include providing ELA instruction to SWD with nondisabled peers in a general education classroom and providing small group instruction focused on individual needs using grade level reading materials.

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

Ward-Highlands showed the most improvement in Math achievement over the last 3 FSA assessments. When analyzing multiple sources of data Ward-Highlands consistently performs above the district in ELA and Math but performs at or just below the state in achievement. According to data from 2019 to 2021 3rd grade ELA achievement, increased 20% and math achievement increased.

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

Ward-Highlands focused on tier 1 math instruction when progress monitoring data showed students regressed from 2019 when students were provided at home online instruction to 2020. Teachers in grades 3-5 used multiple resources to provide rigorous instruction. Resources included IXL math,

math kickstarts, small group math instruction, and math MTSS groups based on individual student need.

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

In order to accelerate learning with SWD and the bottom quartile in 4th and 5th grade, Ward-Highlands will provide differentiated small group instruction provided by the general education teacher, the inclusion teacher, and the ESE paraprofessional. When analyzing progress monitoring data Ward-Highlands will have a focus on SWD and the bottom quartile. ELA and Math action plans will be developed based on data from iReady and quarterly learning checks.

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.

Professional development opportunities will include working with students with disabilities in the general education setting facilitated by the ESE specialist and the behavior specialist. The Ward-Highlands dean will facilitate a monthly student engagement PD that will include teachers sharing best practices.

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

Additional services being provided will include a focus on differentiated instruction provided in small groups, an ESE paraprofessional focused on the bottom quartile, progress monitoring data broken down into individual subgroups for analyzing growth, and embedding teacher lead best practices during professional development and collaborative planning. Providing general education and inclusion teachers with professional opportunities to strengthen their pedagogy will have a lasting impact over time.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2021, FSA Reading data 43% of students in grades 3-5 are nonproficient in reading and 61% of the students in the bottom quartile are not making adequate growth in reading. In 2019, 45% of the students in the bottom quartile were not making adequate growth in reading which is an increase of 16%. Of the students in the bottom quartile 44% are in the SWD subgroup and 27% of that subgroup are in self-contained classrooms. The learning gap between students with disabilities and grade level proficiency is increasing.
Measurable Outcome:	Learning gains in ELA for the bottom quartile will increase from 39% to 50% on the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Quarterly assessments, iReady progress monitoring, and MTSS data will be analyzed during collaborative planning sessions and data meetings. Data for students with disabilities and students in the bottom quartile will be identified and monitored separately so individual action plans can be modified based on current data. Administration will conduct walk throughs during the reading block and provide feedback to teachers based on task alignment to the current standard and focus standards during small group instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group academic instruction is needed for students in the bottom quartile according to the 2021 FSA data and to students with disabilities in grades 3-5. The inclusion teacher, the general education teacher, and the ESE paraprofessional will facilitate small group instruction. Differentiated instruction will be provided by the general education teacher during whole group instruction with support given to identify students by the inclusion teacher and ESE paraprofessional.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	FSA trend shows there is a need for a focus on students in the bottom quartile and students in the SWD subgroup. Students in the EBD and VE self contained units have limited access to instruction in the general education classrooms due to their specialized needs. Allowing for students to learn in small groups with the inclusion teacher, the general education teacher, and the ESE paraprofessional will allow for individual needs to be met. Staff will be able to provide standards based instruction differentiated by student need and provide immediate support to struggling students.

Action Steps to Implement

The ESE specialist and behavior specialist will provide professional development to instructional staff on best practices when working with students with disabilities. There will be a focus on understanding accommodations and how to provide rigorous instruction using individual student accommodations.

Person Responsible Carmen Smiley (carmen.smiley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Instructional staff in the Ward-Highlands self-contained units will work with ELA and math academic coaches to create lesson plans based on grade level expectations. The staff will also identify students that are prepared to be successful in the general education classroom and push the students out for one or more subjects. This will allow ESE self-contained students the opportunity to learn with nondisabled peers.

Person Responsible Jessica Walden (jessica.walden@marion.k12.fl.us)

An inclusion teacher and an ESE paraprofessional will focus on students in the bottom quartile for learning gains according to the most recent FSA data. They will provide small group and individualized instruction within the general education classroom.

**Person
Responsible** Carmen Smiley (carmen.smiley@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: When analyzing the FSA data from 2018 to 2021 the trend line for achievement is going down. In 2018 the science achievement was 60%, in 2019 it was at 52%, and in 2021 the science achievement was at 45%. Progress monitoring using quarterly science assessments in grades 3-5 in 2021 shows the same downward trend line in grade 5 where achievement went from 58% in the fall to 43% in the spring.

Measurable Outcome: When instructional staff provide opportunities for students to engage in rigorous science instruction and hands on science experiments then 5th grade achievement will increase from 45% on the 2021 FSA to 52% on the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: Data collected from quarterly assessments in grades 3-5 will be analyzed during collaborative planning and data meetings. Students in grade 5 will participate in the district science CSMA 2 times this year. The data will be compared and used to modify action plans in place to improve science achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carmen Smiley (carmen.smiley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students in all grades will learn the Scientific Method using their grade level standards and curriculum resources. Students in grades kindergarten-2nd will participate in at least one hands on science experiment following all of the steps in the Scientific Method. Students in grades 3-5 will participate in multiple hands on science experiments in whole group, small groups, and individually 2 or more times during the school year. The Science Coach will monitor experiments to ensure they are standards based and grade level appropriate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to research conducted in 2014 by the National Academy of Sciences it was found that "active learning leads to increases in examination performance that would raise average grades by a half a letter, and that failure rates under traditional lecturing increase by 55% over the rates observed under active learning." Teachers in all grade levels will conduct approved experiments with their students during the school year. Teachers in grades 4-5 will provide students with multiple opportunities in small group and individually to conduct approved experiments. Students in grade 5 will conduct their own approved experiment following the Scientific Method with support from their teacher and the school's Science Coach.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional teachers in grades 3-5 will specialize in the science standards by teaming with 1-2 additional teachers to provide instruction in all other core subjects. In 3rd and 4th grade we have 3 teams where one teacher in each team focuses on science instruction. In 5th grade we have 2 teachers specializing in science and providing instruction to 3 classes each along with one teacher providing instruction in all core subjects.

Person Responsible: Treasa Buck (treasa.buck@marion.k12.fl.us)

The math & science coach at Ward-Highlands will work with teachers in grades kindergarten to 5th grade in providing standards focused science instruction. She will provide strategies and resources weekly and review data quarterly with grades 3-5 after each quarterly assessment.

Person Responsible: Karly Miller (karly.miller@marion.k12.fl.us)

Students in grades kindergarten-2 will engage in a classroom science experiment following the scientific method, students in 3rd grade will work in small groups engaging in a science experiment following the

scientific method, and students in grades 4 and 5 will engage in individual science experiments following the scientific method. All of the science experiments will be on display at the annual science night. Individual projects in 5th grade will be judged and students will be provided feedback on their project using a science project rubric.

Person Responsible Karly Miller (karly.miller@marion.k12.fl.us)

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.

N/A

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.

Ward-Highlands Elementary School adopted the Soft Skills initiative as their schoolwide expectations. The expectations include the following 5 traits: Team Player, Dependable and Reliable, Great Work Ethic, Positive Attitude, and being a Good Communicator. These five Soft Skill expectations are embedded in all areas of the school environment and is expected to be shown through their academics and behavior. There is a staff piece to our Soft Skill initiative that allows staff members to praise other staff members for showing those same traits. The student and staff Soft Skill Superhero awards are announced on the morning to congratulate the recipients and to encourage others to exhibit those same traits.

The dean at Ward-Highlands facilitates and monitors the effectiveness of the program. She collects the data, provides strategies to classroom teachers on how to highlight a specific trait, and speaks about the positive impact on the school when everyone works hard to exhibit the Soft Skill expectations. Members of the leadership team make positive phone calls home to students who receive a Positive Referral that highlights one of the five traits.

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

Involving families and the community in the school's culture is crucial to maintaining a positive learning environment for students. It is important that all members of the school are recognized for their efforts and encouraged to continue their great work. Ward- Highlands has two local churches that provide support through school supply donations for students and teachers, providing monthly snack baskets for the staff, and participating in a yearly school beatification event. The leadership team makes positive phone calls home when a student earns a Soft Skills Superhero award and that creates a positive bond between the school and home. All stakeholders are invited to join the Ward-Highlands School Advisory Committee and the Parent Teacher Organization.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00