Polk County Public Schools

Winston Academy Of Engineering

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Winston Academy Of Engineering

3415 SWINDELL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

http://schools.polk-fl.net/winston

Demographics

Principal: Lucus Wilkins

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2013

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)	80%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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

Winston Academy Of Engineering

3415 SWINDELL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

http://schools.polk-fl.net/winston

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	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Our mission is to collaborate and use creative thinking to solve real-world problems, build and achieve dreams, embrace diverse cultures, and cultivate competitive engineers by preparing them for a diverse global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Winston Academy of Engineering will ensure the highest standards of intellectual development through a stimulating and comprehensive STEM program with an emphasis on Engineering. The learning community is actively involved to instill within students the courage to take appropriate risks, and have the confidence to accept challenges. Together we will give rise to students who are resilient and adaptable, equipped with knowledge and a 21st century skill set to achieve their greatest potential in an ever changing, diverse society.

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
Brown, Ava	Principal	To oversee the instructional and operational functions of the school.
McKenna, Timothy	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in overseeing the instructional and operation functions of the school, to maintain schoolwide discipline and oversee facilities operations.
Cox, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	To assist teachers in developing lesson plans, implementing curriculum, and meeting the needs of students, to provide schoolwide professional development and individual coaching as needed. To maintain all Title I documentation.
Stedem-Wyma, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	To teach gifted students in grades K-3 and assist with coaching responsibilities as needed.
Pion, Debra	Teacher, K-12	Teaching gifted students in grades 4-5 and serving as an instructional coach for teachers.
Dickinson, Brianna	Teacher, K-12	Teaches the STEM Lab for all classes grades K-5

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/23/2013, Lucus Wilkins

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

530

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

5

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

5

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	83	88	87	77	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	15	7	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	12	23	23	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	4	11	8	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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 7/12/2021

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	83	76	86	86	89	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	14	14	9	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	5	1	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	9	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Dec. 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	2	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	

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	83	76	86	86	89	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	14	14	9	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	5	1	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	9	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Dec. 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	2	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	

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				74%	51%	57%	62%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	51%	58%	63%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	49%	53%	51%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				74%	57%	63%	73%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	56%	62%	51%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	47%	51%	36%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				59%	47%	53%	59%	53%	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	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	48%	29%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	47%	26%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	83%	56%	27%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	51%	17%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	59%	45%	14%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR Early Lit was used for first grade, STAR Reading was used for grades 2-5, STAR Math was used for Grades 1-5. District Quarterly Assessments were used for Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61%	75%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45%	68%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	63%	50%
	English Language Learners	50%	67%	73%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	84%	78%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	77%	74%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	63%	50%	38%
	English Language Learners	58%	67%	67%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	92%	81%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53%	66%	75%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	40%	60%
	English Language Learners	40%	50%	56%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	67%	77%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	68%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	67%	50%	67%
	English Language Learners	40%	70%	40%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66%	69%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62%	60%	51%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	21%	29%
	English Language Learners	64%	64%	64%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	77%	80%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	71%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	36%	57%	43%
	English Language Learners	73%	82%	82%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55%	63%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	59%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	11%	10%
	English Language Learners	44%	53%	28%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	59%	62%	51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	54%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	20%	NA
	English Language Learners	33%	44%	33%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55%	62%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	40%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	55%	17%	20%
	English Language Learners	64%	50%	64%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75%	68%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56%	48%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	67%	17%	40%
	English Language Learners	75%	58%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	65%	54%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	22%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	33%	50%
	English Language Learners	65%	57%	58%

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	17			21							
ELL	58	43		62	21		46				
ASN	91			91							
BLK	45	36	10	41	21	15	46				
HSP	57	45		59	25		53				
WHT	80	20		84	32		84				
FRL	52	28	20	48	20	9	32				

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	20	47	55	35	67	58					
ELL	62	71		58	46	27	33				
ASN	100			100							

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
BLK	52	57	50	53	48	41	27				
HSP	75	71	60	73	59	33	67				
WHT	90	71		91	80		78				
FRL	59	63	52	64	61	45	42				

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	17	42		33	33						
ELL	52	72	67	64	52	55					
BLK	33	44	43	52	32	24	29				
HSP	66	73	67	76	64	56	56				
WHT	80	67		86	55		81				
FRL	53	61	53	65	49	34	45				

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	46
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	52
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	91
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	31
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	54
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	60
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

In Third Grade Reading, 30% of students are not proficient. The weakest strand is Integrating Knowledge. Although we do not have scores for the remaining grade levels, assessment of previous year's data shows that Integrating Knowledge is consistently a weak strand across grades 3-5. In Math, students in grade 5 consistently show a drop in proficiency with Fractions being the weakest area of performance.

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

In Reading, the greatest need for improvement is students in the lowest quartile. These students often struggle to demonstrate learning gains each year, which affects their ability to catch up and reach the level needed to demonstrate proficiency. In Math, proficiency rates are higher overall, but scores in fifth grade show a lower level of proficiency than earlier grade levels with Fractions being the weakest domain.

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 factors that contribute to this need are the necessity of following the MTSS process seamlessly as students advance in grade level. Students often fall through the cracks from year to year and are required to begin the process over too late in the year. Holding face to face data PLCs on a regular basis will address this need and hold teachers accountable for providing students with the required interventions.

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

The greatest area of improvement is in the overall proficiency for Reading. We grew 12% on the 2019 state assessments. Math showed a small increase, 1%. Science remained the same at 59%.

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

The factors that contributed to this improvement were streamlining the planning process so that instruction was consistently rigorous across the grade level.

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

Revisiting the need for establishing high expectations for all students is a strategy that will be used to accelerate learning. Goal setting and monitoring for individual students will be used to accomplish this goal.

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 theme for this school year will be "Chasing Dreams, Reaching Potential" which correlates to establishing high expectations for students and staff. Teachers will be introduced to the theme during

the pre-planning week and will complete a book study on Practice Perfect by Doug Lemov Teachers will set their own goals for the year and will be required to implement goals with their students. The book study will provide strategies and tips to help teachers and students to achieve their goals.

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

Holding Data PLCs every 4-6 weeks where classroom data, MTSS Data, and STAR data will be analyzed is an additional service that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement. These PLCs will also include a teacher reflection component so that teachers where teachers will revisit their goal for the year, as well.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA Subgroups has been selected as an area of focus because Students with disabilities are not performing at the same level of proficiency as other subgroups in both ELA and Math. Because Winston follows an inclusion model for ESE services, these students receive additional support within small groups provided by the ESE inclusion teacher, the ESE inclusion para, and/or the classroom teacher. The instruction taking place within these groups, according to the data, is not targeting the specific deficits these students have.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like students with disabilities to increase their proficiency in ELA from 20% to 25% during the 2020-2021 school year. In Math, we would like this subgroup to increase from 35% to 40%.
Monitoring:	STAR Assessment data for this ESSA subgroup will be analyzed after the three progress monitoring windows for STAR in order to determine if progress is being made toward the goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data from classroom formative, classroom summative, and progress monitoring assessments will be used to create small group interventions. Assessments will be analyzed according to specific items and skills in order to identify the areas of deficit that need to be addressed in small groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using data to drive instruction allows teachers to focus on the greatest areas of need and therefore close the achievement gap for these students at a faster rate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop an accountability tool for ESE inclusion staff, teachers, and instructional paras who will be responsible for intervention groups.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

2. Train ESE inclusion teacher, intervention teachers, and instructional paras in using the accountability tool.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

3. Monitor the completion of the tool to ensure students are being provided with interventions on a regular basis.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

4. Host Curriculum Planning meetings to plan whole group lessons and interventions using supplemental resources and instructional supplies such as Florida Ready, Brain Pop, and USA Studies Weekly. All Curriculum Planning will be facilitated by the School-Based Coaches.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

5. Invite students with disabilities to participate in Extended Learning programs.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

6. Provide teachers with resources that meet the needs and interests of students such as library books, classroom libraries, and funding for field trips.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Winston did not perform as well as the state or the district in math learning gains for the bottom quartile. Our percentage of learning gains for the bottom quartile was 40% while the district was 47% and the state was 51%.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like to see Math Learning Gains for the Bottom Quartile reach 50% during the 2019-2020 school year.
Monitoring:	Small group instruction will be required to be listed in the weekly lesson plans that are checked weekly by the Assistant Principal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data from classroom formative,summative, and progress monitoring assessments will be used to create small group interventions. Assessments will be analyzed according to item and skill in order to determine the specific skills that are needed for small group remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using data to drive instruction allows teachers to focus on the greatest areas of need and therefore close the achievement gap for these students at a faster rate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop an accountability tool for teachers and instructional paras who are responsible for intervention groups.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

2. Train intervention teachers and instructional paras in using the accountability tool.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

3. Monitor the completion of the tool to ensure students are being provided with interventions on a regular basis.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

4. Host Curriculum Planning meetings to plan whole group lessons and interventions using supplemental resources and instructional materials such as Florida Ready, Brain Pop, USA Studies Weekly, Reflex, and Nearpod.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

5. Invite students in the lowest quartile to participate in Extended Learning.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

6. Require teachers to set instructional goals for themselves for the school year and complete a book study with Doug Lemov's Practice Perfect. Teachers will be able to utilize the strategies listed in the book to practice and work toward their goal.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

7. Require teachers to set goals with students in order to establish and maintain high expectations for all. Progress toward goals will be discussed during Data PLCs every 4-6 weeks.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Due to a lack of discipline data to report, there was no information on the website listed above.

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.

Winston will partner with families to ensure the highest standards of intellectual development through a comprehensive STEM program. Parents will receive effective and consistent communication regarding curriculum and the progress of students. They will also receive resources they can use in the home to assist.

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

Pre-school Programs: The Head Start Program is coordinated by the District Office and housed at Winston Academy to prepare future kindergarten students with academic and social skills.

Title III/ESOL: Supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their families are coordinated through the District.

SAC: Parents are notified of the SAC meetings at the beginning of the year via the school calendar that is distributed in the agenda. In addition, parents are reminded of the SAC meetings via the school Facebook page and marquee.

PTA: PTA invites parents to join at the Kindergarten Kick-off and Fall Orientation each year. PTA also distributes information regarding upcoming events and volunteer opportunities via their Facebook page and email. PTA also helps to solicit business partners via the same means.

Community Agencies and Business Partners: Community agencies and business partners are solicited through various PTA and staff members making phone calls to request supplies and donations for various

projects and events. In addition, each November, the school hosts the Great American Teach In to develop relationships with community members and grow interest in partnering with our school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**