R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

5500 YATES RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (51%)
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

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

5500 YATES RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

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	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

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

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.

We will ensure learning takes place for all through high expectations, family involvement, and instruction rich in communication and technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students, families, and staff work hand in hand to develop responsible, respectful, reliable, lifelong learners . . . every child, every family, every day..."Everything begins with an idea!"

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
Miller , Christopher	Principal	Provides leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Upton, Tracie	Assistant Principal	Assists the school principal by providing leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Marolda, Denise	Instructional Coach	The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Guptill, Erin	Instructional Coach	The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Allen, Marieka	Instructional Coach	The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Camp, Shelley	Instructional Coach	The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Anderson, Katie	Teacher, ESE	LEA Facilitator: This position exists to coordinate educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. The person in this role will serve as the LEA (Local Education Agency) representative at staffings and IEP (Individual Education Plan) meetings at the assigned school. Simultaneously, this staff member will provide direct support to students with disabilities and their general education and ESE teachers to promote inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education environment

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2018, Christopher Miller

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.*

2

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

800

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

6

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

13

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	88	133	128	122	118	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	729
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	28	24	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	49	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	37	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	39	22	52	58	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227

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	3	14	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	3	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/13/2021

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	132	124	119	148	142	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	805
Attendance below 90 percent	17	25	14	13	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	1	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	6	20	6	43	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Course failure in Math	3	7	5	14	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	21	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	21	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. Star Reading	0	1	5	24	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. Star Math	0	3	17	14	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	6	20	20	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	132	124	119	148	142	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	805
Attendance below 90 percent	17	25	14	13	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	1	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	6	20	6	43	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Course failure in Math	3	7	5	14	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	21	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	21	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. Star Reading	0	1	5	24	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. Star Math	0	3	17	14	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	6	20	20	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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				50%	51%	57%	49%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	51%	58%	51%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	49%	53%	47%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	57%	63%	56%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	56%	62%	60%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	47%	51%	40%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	47%	53%	55%	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	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	48%	-9%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	56%	-12%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	45%	4%	53%	-4%
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 tool used for grade levels is STAR Reading, STAR Math, and STAR Early Lit. Students in grades 1-5 utilize STAR Math along with STAR and STAR Early Lit. If students show proficiency in STAR Early Lit, students move into STAR Reading. Kindergarten students utilize STAR Early Lit as the progress monitoring tool.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41	54	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	71	62
	Students With Disabilities	8	50	42
	English Language Learners	28	45	35
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79	86	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	75	85	70
	Students With Disabilities	50	70	45
	English Language Learners	72	75	61

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54	55	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	67	83	75
	Students With Disabilities		75	67
	English Language Learners			67
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	58	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	49	38
	Students With Disabilities	33	44	40
	English Language Learners		18	10

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47	48	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	40	39
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	13	24	17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53	56	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	53	43
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	18	26	20

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	50	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	42	32
	Students With Disabilities	17	39	28
	English Language Learners	23	39	24
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	59	63	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	56	48
	Students With Disabilities	33	39	35
	English Language Learners	50	52	40

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	55	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	45	38
	Students With Disabilities	5	11	6
	English Language Learners	33	30	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56	59	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	45	39
	Students With Disabilities	22	21	32
	English Language Learners	44	40	42
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61	55	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	40	43
	Students With Disabilities	50	26	28
	English Language Learners	69	53	70

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	21	38	54	33	50	45	14				
ELL	24	38	43	34	48	42	16				
BLK	25	40		31	33		8				
HSP	35	39	47	46	58	53	36				
WHT	50	36		69	61		53				
FRL	32	37	50	43	46	55	21				
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	21	30	32	40	49	39	29				
ELL	22	34	30	44	51	63	18				
BLK	35	39	31	40	55	43	46				
HSP	43	45	30	55	55	46	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
WHT	60	50	50	69	63	50	63				
FRL	40	46	38	54	55	42	43				
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	21	37	36	23	34						
ELL	21	41	37	41	63	53					
BLK	39	48	38	37	40	20	50				
HSP	43	51	48	53	62	52	58				
WHT	57	52	48	62	64	35	55				
FRL	43	48	48	49	55	40	43				

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	48
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	27
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	45
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	54
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	41
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?

Trends that emerge in progress monitoring data in students perform higher in the winter assessment versus fall and spring in both Reading and Math. In Reading, students who are English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities are performing lower than other subgroups. When analyzing data, there is a steady decline in students proficient in ELA in grades 2 and 3. Students are performing better in Math showing an increase in proficiency across all grade levels.

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

Data components that show the greatest need for improvement is ELA in all grade levels. Currently, 3rd grade students performed 12 points lower than projected on FSA versus STAR Reading. English Language Learners in grades 2 and 3 are performing well below all other grades in Mathematics. English Language Learnings are performing significantly lower in ELA in all grade levels except 2nd grade. ELA whole group instruction and small group instruction need to be revamp to meet the needs of all learners. Math small group instruction must be implemented with fidelity in order to meet the needs of all learners.

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement were lack of student accountability, teachers inability to identify and provide consistent research based interventions. Interventions were not matched to student need; therefore students were not receiving the necessary instruction to close the achievement gaps. New actions will include professional development in research based best practices for small group instruction along with accountability and monitoring from administration.

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

Data components the indicated improvements were 5th grade Science. In 2019, Mathematics across all grade levels indicated increases in student proficiency.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement was the hiring of a Math Interventionist focusing on grades 3-5 and having our Dean of Students work with teachers in Kg-2nd grade. In addition, professional learning communities were allowed, by contract, two times per week. The school also had a focus on developing and monitoring student results based on formative assessments.

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

To accelerate learning, small group instruction will need to be implemented with fidelity along with monitoring and utilizing formative assessments to make instructions decisions (differentiate instruction) to meet individual student needs. During weekly collaborative planning, teachers will be required to fill out their weekly data sheets with in formation such as, formative data, attendance, AR, behavior. As a PLC, we will discuss this data and make informed discussions about next steps for the

student, class, teacher, and all stakeholders.

All students will be receiving hands on learning through our STEM model. To accelerate students, the gifted teacher will be pulling higher achieving students during small group instruction to provide a more rigorous level of instruction through literature circles, etc. on grade level standards. The gifted teacher will be incorporating higher order thinking skills into lessons during the small group time. During the school year, Administration will have quarterly Data Chats with teachers to discuss grading, progress monitoring, and identification of students who are need acceleration or remediation.

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 in providing researched based best practices for small group instruction/ MTSS/differentiated instruction, new B.E.S.T standards (KG-2nd), STEM implementation, and new reading curriculum (FL Wonders). Teacher will be provided STEM training during pre-planning week outlining the implementation of STEM into the classroom. Teacher will work through each of the stages with due date for implementation. Administration will then observe teachers and provide feedback based on their state they should be working in. By November, all classrooms will be in Stage 3, which is full implementation of STEM. Teacher will receive a full day of planning with our Math and Reading coaches to help assist with planning meaningful tasks that align to their standards.

Teachers will continue to participate in PLC's. One time per month, teachers will meet as an MTSS team to discuss scores and other pertinent information about students. Teachers will also participate in quarterly data chats with administration that will focus on the whole child (attendance, grades, behavior, formative, and summative data).

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

Additional services that are being implemented are the addition of 2 Math coaches, a Reading Interventionist, 2 ELA coaches, ongoing STEM professional development, weekly collaborative planning, and continued implementation of differentiated instruction based on data analysis.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data is indicating achievement gaps among our subgroups, particularly English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. Progress monitoring from the 2020-2021 school year indicates a decrease in student proficiency in the area of reading. In order to increase student proficiency differentiated small group instruction along with MTSS documentation must be implemented with fidelity to close achievement gaps. Progress monitoring from the 2020-2021 school year indicates a decrease in student proficiency in the area of Math. In order to increase student proficiency differentiated small group instruction along with MTSS documentation must be implemented with fidelity to close achievement gaps.
Measurable Outcome:	If the school implements research based best practices (SIPPS, Leveled Literacy Intervention, Guided Reading, FL Wonders Intervention; Math- iReady, cPalms, and student workbooks) and targeted small group instruction, ELA proficiency and learning gains and Math proficiency and learning gains will increase by five percentage points by on progress monitoring data along with FSA results.
Monitoring:	Small group instruction will be the focus during weekly planning. Administration will be conducting targeted walk-throughs to monitor the fidelity of implementation. The leadership team will be monitoring MTSS plans along with small group plans bi-weekly. Administration will be monitoring grades to ensure students not showing adequate progress are targeted immediately. Quarterly data chats with instructional staff will be held with administration with a focus on small group/MTSS documentation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy being implemented is to use data analysis to identify instructional weaknesses and provide differentiated small group instruction to address student deficiencies. In addition, our Reading Interventionist will focus on the lowest 25% providing intensive small group instruction. We have a paraprofessional assigned to work with students in the area of math to assist with pulling targeted small groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy is close the achievement gaps among a diverse population. The data indicates that students are not internalizing information at a tier one level. In order for students to master grade level standards, students must receive intensive instruction to meet their academic needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be provided professional development in small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

Intermediate grade will be provide iReady/Leveled Literacy Intervention materials to help facilitate standards based instruction during small group time. Primary grade levels will be provided SIPPS to implement with targeted small groups.

Person Responsible	Erin Guptill (erin.guptill@polk-fl.net)

Daily monitoring by administration.

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Small group planning will take place during collaborative planning to create small group plans.

Person Responsible	Marieka Allen (marieka.allen@polk-fl.net)

Primary teachers will be provided ongoing professional development in new BEST standards. This will also be a focus during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible	Marieka Allen (marieka.allen@polk-fl.net)

Intermediate teachers will be provided iReady materials to assist with standards based math instruction.

Person Responsible	Denise Marolda (denise.marolda@polk-fl.net)

Weekly collaborative planning will focus on data analysis and creating small group plans and implementing STEM strategies.

Person Responsible	Denise Marolda (denise.marolda@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will implement student accountability when they work in centers (writing to summarize, etc.)

Person Responsible	Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on FSA and progress monitoring results, students who are English Language Learners are below the 41% as compared to other subgroups. This subgroup did not make adequate growth; therefore, they are targeted for intensive instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	If the school implements research based best practices (SIPPS, Leveled Literacy Intervention, Guided Reading, FL Wonders Intervention and iReady)and targeted small group instruction, ELA proficiency and learning gains will increase by five percentage points on progress monitoring data along with FSA results.
Monitoring:	Small group instruction will be the focus during weekly planning. Administration will be conducting targeted walk-throughs to monitor the fidelity of implementation. The leadership team will be monitoring MTSS plans along with small group plans bi-weekly. Administration will be monitoring grades to ensure students not showing adequate progress are targeted immediately. Quarterly data chats with instructional staff will be held with administration with a focus on small group/MTSS documentation along with the targeted ELL subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy being implemented is to use data analysis to identify instructional weaknesses and provide differentiated small group instruction to address student deficiencies. In addition, our title one paraprofessional will focus on the small group instruction with our ELL subgroup.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy is close the achievement gaps among our ELL subgroup. The data indicates that students are not internalizing information at a tier one level. In order for students to master grade level standards, students must receive intensive instruction to meet their academic needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and support staff will identify students who are in the targeted subgroup.

Person Responsible	Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

Quarterly data chats with administration.

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Small group plans will have a focus on targeted subgroup.

Person Responsible	Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

Administration will check grades on a weekly basis in order to identify students who are not performing.

Person Responsible	Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on FSA and progress monitoring results, students who are Students with Disabilities are below the 34% as compared to other subgroups. This subgroup did not make adequate growth; therefore, they are targeted for intensive instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	If the school implements research based best practices (SIPPS, Leveled Literacy Intervention, Guided Reading, FL Wonders Intervention and iReady) targeted small group instruction, ELA proficiency and learning gains will increase by five percentage points on progress monitoring data along with FSA results.
Monitoring:	Small group instruction will be the focus during weekly planning. Administration will be conducting targeted walk-throughs to monitor the fidelity of implementation. The leadership team will be monitoring MTSS plans along with small group plans bi-weekly. Administration will be monitoring grades to ensure students not showing adequate progress are targeted immediately. Quarterly data chats with instructional staff will be held with administration with a focus on small group/MTSS documentation along with the targeted Students with Disabilities subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy being implemented is to use data analysis to identify instructional weaknesses and provide differentiated small group instruction to address student deficiencies. In addition, ESE teachers will be providing small group, separate class, or resource models of instruction and will participate in weekly collaborative planning with their assigned grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy is close the achievement gaps among our Students with Disabilities subgroups. The data indicates that students are not internalizing information at a tier one level. In order for students to master grade level standards, students must receive intensive instruction to meet their academic needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Quarterly data chats with ESE support staff.

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

ESE support staff will participate in weekly collaborative planning and will have plans to target Students with Disabilities subgroup.

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Administration will check weekly grades to ensure students are making progress as compared to their peers.

Person Responsible	Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to recent Florida Standards Assessment, FSA, Wagner Elementary scores below the 50% in ELA in the following grades: 3rd (32%), 4th (45), and 5th (39). Due to the low percentage in ELA, we are targeting tier 1 instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	If the school implements strategies to expose students to grade level text, equivalent exposure to grade level questioning, tasks, writing, and research, then ELA proficiency will increase 5 percentage points in each grade level.
Monitoring:	Instruction will be the focus during weekly planning. Administration will be conducting targeted walk-throughs to monitor the fidelity of implementation. During collaborative planning, teachers will have a facilitated discussion with the ELA coaches pertaining to the results from their weekly formatives. Grade levels will be comparing data to determine how to reteach or accelerate learning. Administration and the leadership team will track teacher data to provide coaching/assistance when needed. Quarterly data chats with instructional staff will be held with administration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy being implemented is to use data analysis (formative and summative) to identify instructional weaknesses and strengths. In addition, our Reading Interventionist and paraprofessional will focus on the on a targeted group of students to provide instruction in grades 3-5).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy is close the achievement gaps among a diverse population. The data indicates that students are not internalizing information at a tier one level. In order for students to master grade level standards, students must be expose to grade level text, equivalent exposure to grade level questioning, tasks, writing, and research.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative planning with grade levels and ELA coaches.

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will analyze students data to determine strengths and remediation/reteach (formative and summative)

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will implement summary writing to help with understanding student thinking.

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@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.

Our school discipline has drastically decreased from 2017-2018 with 82 suspensions to 2020-2021 with only 42 suspensions. In comparison to the state of Florida, R. Bruce Wagner is labeled a moderate school, 767 out of 1395. Analyzing our current discipline data, the school did have several Abusive Language/Conduct towards a staff member. Majority of our discipline referrals/suspension are minor interruption/behavior on campus and bus suspensions. We currently implement PBiS, which is our tier one behavior model. Students who exhibit chronic behaviors, have behavior plans that are monitored by administration, school counselor, and support staff. The school culture and environment are continuously monitored through our PBiS committee.

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.

At R. Bruce Wagner Elementary, we foster all student learners and their families. We hold meaningful Family Nights to help promote different aspects of our students learning. Parents and families can attend the events and learn new ways to help their child at home. R. Bruce Wagner Elementary will continue implementing STEM initiatives into our lessons for the 2020-2021 school year. All students will now be exposed to critical thinking, hands on learning, and collaboration with their classmates. Each student learner is taken into consideration when creating engaging lessons with utilizing technology to enhance instruction. RBW has been a model PBiS School since 2013! We celebrate our students behaviors through a point system (token economy) that is individual to each student. Throughout the school-year, students can participate in school-wide dances, Spring Fling, and other various activities. We value our students, families, and the community and always welcome volunteers.

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

Families are major stakeholders at R. Bruce Wagner Elementary. As a school we foster a positive relationship through communication via Class Dojo, family nights, and conferences. Families are encouraged to participate in celebrations that take place throughout the school year. We invite all families to participate in our School Advisory Committee and provide input on making R. Bruce Wagner Elementary

successful. Our Parent Teacher Association assists with helps to address barriers with fundraisers and community events.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00