

Polk County Public Schools

Wendell Watson 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	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Wendell Watson Elementary School

6800 WALT WILLIAMS RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/wwe>

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Burgess

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2016

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)	84%
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 (58%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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

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	23

Wendell Watson Elementary School

6800 WALT WILLIAMS RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/wwe>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">79%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">43%</p>

School Grades History

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

Wendell Watson Elementary school in partnership with family and community will provide rigorous instruction for ALL students as we prepare them for a successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will become life longlearners through rigorous learning experiences at Wendell Watson Elementary.

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
Burgess, Kelly	Principal	Principal Kelly Burgess leads instruction, school improvement, school safety, and provides management of all school functions. She leads observations, evaluations, professional development and data reviews. Mrs. Burgess works with PTA and SAC. Student data is monitored and analyzed through data chats and collaborative planning.
Poe-Liburd, Tanya	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Tanya Liburd serves as textbook manager, testing coordinator, and leads discipline. She works closely with the school PBIS team to analyze school data. She provides teachers with classroom management support. She monitors instruction through daily walkthroughs and provides frequent forms of feedback.
Long, Megan	Reading Coach	Megan Long, Reading Coach, provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and the implementation of rigorous reading instruction as it pertains to Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and assists teachers with standards-based lesson planning.
Oglesby, Melanie	Math Coach	Melanie Oglesby, Math Coach, provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and the implementation of rigorous math instruction as it pertains to Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and assists teachers with standards-based lesson planning.
Alexander, Melissa	Reading Coach	Megan Long, Reading Coach, provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and the implementation of rigorous reading instruction as it pertains to Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and assists teachers with standards-based lesson planning.
Martin, Nicole	Other	Nicole Martin, Interventionist, provides intensive remediation through small group instruction. She analyzes data with the classroom teachers to scaffold instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
Vandersteen, Michelle	School Counselor	Michelle Vandersteen analyzes and monitors Tier 2 and Tier 3 data and assists with parent conferences. She provides support for students that need social and emotional support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2016, Kelly Burgess

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.*

3

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

827

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

8

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

11

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	117	148	142	122	131	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	800
Attendance below 90 percent	15	28	30	19	31	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	1	8	9	7	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	1	3	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	25	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	32	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	23	57	32	45	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	212

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	13	20	16	21	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

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	12	12	11	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

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	137	146	132	145	139	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	835
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	5	2	3	4	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	3	1	2	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	25	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	32	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Dec. 2019 Star Reading level 1	0	0	0	29	19	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Dec. 2019 Star Math level 1	0	0	0	19	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
	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	3	1	2	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	137	146	132	145	139	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	835
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	5	2	3	4	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	3	1	2	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	25	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	32	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Dec. 2019 Star Reading level 1	0	0	0	29	19	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Dec. 2019 Star Math level 1	0	0	0	19	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
	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	3	1	2	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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				59%	51%	57%	55%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	51%	58%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	49%	53%	43%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	57%	63%	60%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	56%	62%	58%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	47%	51%	48%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				67%	47%	53%	62%	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	59%	52%	7%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	48%	3%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	47%	13%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	51%	13%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	65%	45%	20%	53%	12%
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 was used to calculate number of students proficient for Grade 1. STAR Reading was used to calculate number of students proficient for Grades 2nd-5th. STAR Math was used to calculate number of students proficient for Grades 1st-5th. Grade 5 science data was compiled using district quarterly assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58%	81%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55%	79%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	38%	61%	42%
	English Language Learners	56%	75%	44%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75%	80%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75%	80%	61%
	Students With Disabilities	58%	57%	48%
	English Language Learners	69%	69%	38%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78%	86%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70%	77%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	36%	20%
	English Language Learners	67%	83%	44%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53%	58%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45%	55%	51%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	32%	22%
	English Language Learners	55%	46%	33%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59%	58%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53%	48%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	6%	7%
	English Language Learners	35%	35%	11%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	63%	66%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50%	52%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	20%	7%
	English Language Learners	38%	53%	28%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41%	50%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39%	40%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	3%	9%
	English Language Learners	11%	38%	18%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41%	52%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	39%	31%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	3%	18%
	English Language Learners	50%	33%	18%

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		45%	52%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged		40%	43%	39%
	Students With Disabilities		23%	15%	17%
	English Language Learners		5%	14%	10%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		51%	49%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged		40%	45%	45%
	Students With Disabilities		15%	8%	9%
	English Language Learners		10%	14%	14%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		61%	58%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged		63%	45%	56%
	Students With Disabilities		25%	17%	33%
	English Language Learners		68%	67%	74%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19	38	30	20	44		24				
ELL	27	29	20	29	41		7				
BLK	39	27		23	36		31				
HSP	47	52	33	49	52	55	50				
MUL	54			62							
WHT	60	59		56	71	79	61				
FRL	48	51	37	41	56	65	47				
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	16	30	32	20	35	34	28				
ELL	33	47	46	33	50	50	29				
BLK	34	49	47	46	47	29	43				

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	53	49	44	51	57	44	53				
MUL	57	40		50	70						
WHT	69	69	61	65	70	56	82				
FRL	47	55	52	48	58	49	51				
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	29	28	24	23	35	44	21				
ELL	41	52	54	45	35						
BLK	31	34	35	46	50	35	40				
HSP	57	54	43	61	58	53	69				
MUL	56	57		67	73						
WHT	62	53	50	65	59	53	66				
FRL	47	46	39	53	54	45	60				

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	53
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
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	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

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	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	49
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	58
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	64
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	51
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 comparing the STAR Data from 2019-2020 to the current school year, the overall number of students scoring at the proficient level decreased in all areas. Third grade ELL students did show a slight improvement in both ELA and Math. When comparing the STAR Data for 3rd grade ELA, the results showed a 6% decrease in the number of students scoring at the proficient level and above. While the ESE subgroup numbers have declined, the ELL subgroup has increased in the number of students scoring at the proficient level. The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup has had a slight improvement in 3rd grade. This subgroup has about the same number of students scoring at the proficient level in 4th and 5th grade.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in 4th grade. Overall, their numbers had the largest decline in the number of students scoring at or above the proficient level. 4th grade math decreased from the 2019 FSA to the 2021 STAR Math by 8%. The spring STAR data shows that only 40% of the students are at or above the proficient level. The subgroups at this grade level also had the largest decline in the number of students scoring at or above proficient. The other area for greatest need is the Students with Disabilities subgroup. This subgroup declined at in each grade level in ELA and Math.

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

Fourth grade saw many changes last year. There were four new teachers on the grade level and one teacher resigned mid-year. There was also an increase in the number of students with disabilities. While the number of students increased, the number of teachers remained the same and a teacher resigned. A review of the IEP goals indicated that the resource teachers are making them too generalized. The goals need to match the individual needs of the students. Students with disability teachers will receive more professional development on creating student specific goals. They will also participate in weekly collaborative planning to plan for on grade level instruction. A more rigorous approach to student tasks and matching the full intent of the standard to the task needs to take place. All teachers will receive training on high yield instructional strategies and how to align standards with rigorous instruction.

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

When comparing STAR assessments from 2019-2020 and school year 2020-2021, the ELL subgroup showed the most improvement in third grade. This subgroup made gains in both ELA and Math with

the number of scoring at or above the proficient level. This subgroup had more students scoring at or above the proficient level than the SWD subgroup on STAR ELA and STAR Math in third grade.

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

The third-grade teachers worked with the math coach to create targeted formative assessments based on standards taught on a weekly basis. Instruction was then adjusted as needed. Small groups were created to reteach where needed. Formative assessments were created to track student's mastery of the standards. These assessments were given by the entire grade level and indicated when instruction did not match the full intent of the standard. When reviewing the data by teacher, the leadership team was able to provide individual teacher support as needed.

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

To accelerate learning, teachers will need to understand the difference between acceleration and remediation. The skills that teachers will need are how to provide grade-appropriate assignments when students have not yet mastered previous standards. Teachers will need to scaffold throughout the lesson to provide support where needed while maintaining a level of productive struggle. Lessons need to be taught for acceleration, not remediation. Instruction will need to incorporate high yield strategies. A review of writing samples and formative assessments during collaborative planning will also need to take place. Another strategy will be tutoring students to fill in learning gaps. This will take place during intervention time and after school. Teachers will need to be trained on the new FL B.E.S.T. standards.

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.

To accelerate learning, teachers will participate in Professional Development focused on the difference between acceleration and remediation. Teachers will be provided PD on how to provide grade-appropriate assignments when students have not mastered previous standards. This will be done by focusing instruction on the use of mini lessons. Mini lessons are a way of providing targeted instruction on the skills needed to complete an assignment that is based on the full intent of the standard. PD will also focus on using high yield instructional strategies. Focus on high yield instructional strategies. Teachers will also participate in training on the new B.E.S.T. standards.

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

The math coach and reading coach will aid teachers as needed. Depending on the level of support, the coaches will use the coaching cycle to assist teachers that are struggling with instruction and classroom management. The coaches will work with teachers co-teaching and modeling lessons as needed. Collaborative planning will take place on a weekly basis to ensure lessons are rigorous and meet the full intent of the standard. Leadership team and teachers will participate in peer observations. Observations by the principal and assistant principal will include feedback to the teachers. New teachers will be supported by monthly new teacher meetings held at the school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is on instructional practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction. This focus is important as increasing the rigor of standards-aligned instruction has a direct impact on student success. Teachers need to provide grade level based assignments that are deeply engaging. The number of students scoring at or above the proficient level in both reading and math have declined over the last year.

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome is to increase the students scoring proficient in math and reading by 5 percentage points.

Monitoring: Monthly data chats will be used to monitor student progress. Reading coach, Math coach and School Counselor will meet with teachers on a monthly basis to review progress and change interventions as needed. Teachers and leadership team will review formative assessments, bi-weekly summative assessments and progress monitoring such as Freckle, iStation and AR. The assistant principal will review lesson plans for use of high yield strategies. During collaborative planning, teachers and leadership team will review formative assessments in order to make necessary instructional adjustments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will need to scaffold throughout the lesson to provide support where needed while maintaining a level of productive struggle. Lessons need to be taught for acceleration, not remediation. Instruction will need to incorporate high yield strategies. A review of writing samples and formative assessments during collaborative planning will also need to take place. Another strategy will be tutoring students to fill in learning gaps. This will take place during intervention time and after school. Targeted small group instruction will be utilized in math and ELA to focus on areas of need. Groups will be differentiated based upon formative and summative data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increasing student engagement has a direct impact on student success. By providing opportunities to collaborate together, they will work on social skills and build ownership for learning. Students will spend more time on tasks that are aligned to the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions led by the instructional coaches, Melanie Oglesby, Megan Long, and Melissa Alexander and the team leader. Focus of planning will be a discussion of the new B.E.S.T. standards, creating tasks using high yield instructional strategies and that are aligned to the full intent of the standard. Teachers will also review formative assessments to drive instruction. During the summer, teachers will participate in collaborative planning to reflect on the year and plan rigorous tasks for the students to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible: Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will use supplemental computer programs to assist with individualized reinforcement of standards. iPads will be utilized as well as laptop computers. Teachers will also use supplemental workbooks during tutoring to provide differentiated instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Tanya Poe-Liburd (tanya.poe-liburd@polk-fl.net)

Professional Development will focus on LSI and Marzano high yield instructional strategies. Teachers will participate in a full day of training led by LSI trainers. PLC's will include a book study on How to Make Thinking Visible.

Person Responsible Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The number of students scoring at or above proficient on the FSA ELA was 53%. Fourth grade had 47%. This area of focus will be important to increase the number of students scoring at or above the proficient level. In order to increase the number of students scoring proficient, we will focus on ELA with an increase in the number of students participating in Accelerated Reader. Our data indicates that the students that scored a Level 3 or higher on FSA also had earned over 50 points on AR with 85% accuracy.

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome is to increase the students scoring proficient in reading by 5 percentage points.

Monitoring: Teachers will set monthly goals with students at the beginning of each month. The teachers will track students progress on a weekly basis. The Literacy Coaches and administration will also track the number of AR points per grade level and school and the percent correct.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will take the STAR Reading/ Early Literacy assessments three times a year. This will provide teachers and students with their independent reading level. Students will read books on their independent reading level and take reading tests utilizing the Accelerated Reader program. Teachers will set goals and reading levels for each student. The assessments are comprehension questions based on the books. The students are exposed to fiction and non-fiction material. Teachers are also able to assign certain reading passages and activities that are based on the FL standards. These extra passage activities provide teachers with additional standards based activities that can be incorporated during centers and small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The more reading that students do have a direct impact on their fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Students are engaged in reading as they can pick the books that they are reading. Data indicates students that participate in the AR program increase their proficiency on state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will read books on their independent reading level and take reading tests utilizing the Accelerated Reader program. Teachers will set goals and reading levels for each student. Students will take reading tests on a weekly basis. Teachers will meet with Literacy Coaches and administration every 5 weeks to track student progress. Students will also receive incentives for reaching their goals.

Person Responsible Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

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.

When comparing our data to schools across the state, our school ranks in the very low category. The number of student suspensions has decreased significantly over the past year. This indicates that our school culture and environment is responding positively to our school wide PBIS program. This year we will focus on providing Social and Emotional lessons for students. There will be several students that have been virtually learning for the past year and may need assistance with reentering a brick and mortar classroom. These lessons will also help to build a sense of community in the classroom. This also includes problem-solving skills and communication and understanding, as well as teaching students to embrace diversity and build healthy relationships that will last well into adulthood. The PBIS team meets on a monthly basis to review discipline data and problem solves when there is an increase in discipline referrals. During these meetings, teachers share best practices with others to assist with classroom management.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our school motto at Wendell Watson is "Pride is 5". Our PBIS committee meets monthly to discuss what is going well and ways in which we can improve our school culture and environment. The PBIS committee also develops our monthly rewards for those students who show PRIDE on a daily basis. The committee is comprised of teachers and members of the leadership team. Every day students work to earn 5 PRIDE points and at the end of the month if students have earned 80% of their monthly points they are rewarded. This PRIDE reward is highly promoted by the staff. Parents are also involved because they check their child's agenda daily to see how many points their child earned. Families and teachers are working together to help their children exude positive behaviors in school. In addition to monthly PRIDE rewards, we recognize an "Eagle of the Month" from each classroom. Teachers nominate one student from their class who has been a positive role model for their classmates and showed PRIDE throughout the month. These students are then recognized during their lunch period at the end of the month and eat lunch with a member of the leadership team. Their pictures are also posted in the cafeteria for the entire month. Staff members also pass out "high 5s" to classes who are walking in a quiet, straight line throughout the campus. Administrators also give out a "high5" when they see a classroom working together and reflect our school expectations. This has a positive impact on our school culture because students have to work together as a

team to earn this reward. They begin to build each other up and remind one another to follow the expectations so they can all be rewarded.

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

Parents serve on the school SAC committee. They are active participants in the school PTA. Our stakeholders assist with writing and reviewing the Parent Family and Engagement Plan.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00