W. R. Tolar K 8 School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

W. R. Tolar K 8 School

14757 NW COUNTY ROAD 12, Bristol, FL 32321

wrtolar.com

Demographics

Principal: Rob Wheetley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	71%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
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 Liberty 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

W. R. Tolar K 8 School

14757 NW COUNTY ROAD 12, Bristol, FL 32321

wrtolar.com

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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	97%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

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 Liberty 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.

Tolar School's mission is to develop in every student a sense of PRIDE...
Performance through preparation
Respect
Integrity
Determination
Excellence through effort

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learn It, Live It, Pass It on

We want our school to be one that motivates students and teachers, provides a safe environment physically and emotionally, connects learning to real life, has consistent expectations among students and staff, accentuates the positive, is filled with happy, friendly people who are passionate about children, teaching, and learning, helps children actively participate in their education and accept responsibility in the learning process, and works closely with parents and the community.

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
Wheetley, Rob	Principal	Everything
Green, Brenda	School Counselor	guidance for 5-8
Bennett, Jessica	Assistant Principal	everything
Revell, Bess	School Counselor	guidance for k-4

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Rob Wheetley

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

483

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

9

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

8

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	77	65	57	51	38	42	58	44	40	0	0	0	0	472
Attendance below 90 percent	0	40	32	18	15	23	19	23	22	0	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	7	5	11	10	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	12	0	20	12	7	11	8	16	17	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in Math	5	0	20	5	9	13	8	17	6	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	5	6	13	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	22	5	8	9	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	10	13	4	6	13	5	6	13	0	0	0	0	77

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	5	6	7	5	6	15	5	7	14	0	0	0	0	70

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	10	9	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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 8/3/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	57	63	42	38	39	53	51	42	59	0	0	0	0	444
Attendance below 90 percent	13	13	6	5	6	5	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	3	12	9	14	19	10	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA	19	3	1	0	1	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	6	1	1	0	0	14	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	21	16	22	20	10	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	27	36	22	23	35	0	0	0	0	154
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	6	6	11	19	24	29	38	0	0	0	0	136

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	11	7	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	28
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	57	63	42	38	39	53	51	42	59	0	0	0	0	444
Attendance below 90 percent	13	13	6	5	6	5	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	3	12	9	14	19	10	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA	19	3	1	0	1	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	6	1	1	0	0	14	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	21	16	22	20	10	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	27	36	22	23	35	0	0	0	0	154
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	3	6	6	11	19	24	29	38	0	0	0	0	136

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	11	7	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	28
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				63%	62%	61%	56%	56%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	58%	59%	58%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	51%	54%	56%	47%	52%
Math Achievement				55%	57%	62%	56%	54%	61%
Math Learning Gains				48%	54%	59%	57%	49%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	43%	52%	58%	43%	52%
Science Achievement				56%	51%	56%	49%	52%	57%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement				77%	75%	78%	79%	81%	77%

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	63%	66%	-3%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	64%	-10%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2021					
	2019	48%	52%	-4%	54%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
07	2021					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	52%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
08	2021					
	2019	69%	68%	1%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	72%	65%	7%	62%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	48%	-6%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	39%	-3%	60%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
06	2021					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
07	2021					
	2019	54%	65%	-11%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	15%	11%	4%	46%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	45%	4%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	58%	56%	2%	48%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	75%	74%	1%	71%	4%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	65%	62%	3%	61%	4%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR Reading, STAR Math (K-8)
iReady Reading, Math (K-8)
Performance Matters (Science 3rd-8th)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	13%
	English Language Learners	0%	33%	50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0%	13%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	33%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24%	26%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	26%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	14%	40%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51%	83%	85%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	83%	85%
	Students With Disabilities	40%	17%	17%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	62%	60%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62%	60%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	43%	38%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	51%	83%	83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	83%	83%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	14%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	61%	65%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61%	65%	79%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	8%	18%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	50%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	71%	75%	81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71%	75%	81%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	8%	33%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	44%	41%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	41%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	13%	13%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	53%	69%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53%	69%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	13%	38%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	50%
Science	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	0%	39%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	39%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	36%	60%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	38%	40%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	40%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	8%	13%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	81%	87%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	81%	87%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	14%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	100%	100%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43%	34%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	34%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	50%	100%	100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65%	61%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	61%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	50%	n/a	100%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	37%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	37%	41%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	14%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	56%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	56%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	14%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	51%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	51%	52%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	43%	44%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

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	38	48	31	43	64	54	47				
ELL	52	56		71	81						
BLK	42	55		45	65		54				
HSP	53	51	9	66	66	50	59				
WHT	57	57	48	58	51	38	50	73	68		
FRL	52	55	38	54	54	50	53	64	64		
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	39	43	31	41	45	27	29	70			
ELL	67	64		81	53						
BLK	57	50		29	41	18	27				
HSP	60	59	58	58	41	25	50		80		

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
WHT	64	58	55	57	49	44	61	76	76		
FRL	61	57	51	51	44	36	51	73	83		

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	34	53	56	42	50	50	32				
ELL	77			92							
BLK	46	46		38	53	50	53				
HSP	54	44		58	41		41				
WHT	57	62	63	58	61	62	47	84	79		
FRL	50	54	56	47	51	55	42	77	50		

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	566
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
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	
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	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	56
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	54
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?

Positive trends were learning gains for total population and lowest quartile in math.
Negative trends were 7th grade ELA, 4th grade Math, and 4th ELA.

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

4th grade and 7th grade ELA proficiency rates were significantly below the state average. 4th grade math proficiency rate was also very low (19%) - the lowest in our school history.

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

Possible contributing factors identified as needs for improvement:
1. Attendance effected by COVID quarantines for students and teachers.
2. Master schedule changes from self-contained to departmentalized model during the year (4th grade).
3. Continuous movement between brick and mortar and virtual platforms.
4. Changes in teachers and the experience of those teachers.
5. Administrative changes mid-year.

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

Math was the most improved area. Math learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains showed significant improvement.

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

Scheduled remediation/intervention classes were part of targeted student's daily schedule.

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

1. Identify the target population and provide regular remediation/intervention.
2. Continue to use inclusion teachers to support students with disabilities in the general education setting.
3. Add support in the K-2 grade span with a new reading intervention teacher.
4. Reinstitute quarterly data chats.
5. Monitor attendance and provide incentives for grade levels with the best attendance rates.
6. Use ESSER funds to support summer learning for targeted students.
7. Provide 30 additional minutes of instruction in the after-school program.

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.

1. LSI provided professional learning for ELA Best Standards during the summer which will continue through the school year. Teachers (K-8) participated in the training.

2. Math BEST Training for lead educators was held during the summer.
3. New reading curriculum, "Wonders" was purchased and will be used this year. Curriculum alignment for ELA BEST standards and Wonders curriculum was completed by teacher committees during the summer. These committees will reconvene during the year to adjust pacing guides.
4. All new teachers will be provided a mentor for the school year.
5. Continue to use the support of our technology/data coach to assist teachers with instructional programs.

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

Continue to budget/plan for the services listed above to maintain continuity.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA proficiency for current 5th graders (last year's 4th grade) was 26%. ELA proficiency for current 8th graders (last year's 7th grade) was 44%. These two grade levels had the highest percentage of 2 or more Early Warning Indicators.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the targeted grade level will increase by 20% from the 20-21 STAR Reading scores.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring will occur three times per year for all grade groups. Teachers for grades 5th and 8th will engage in face to face data chats with the principal and school level administration to review progress following each progress monitoring. This group will review data, and problem solve to determine if the strategies for improvement are having the desired impact. Based on the data, instruction will be modified to address identified weaknesses. Students identified for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction will be closely monitored to ensure that interventions are effective and strategies changed as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rob Wheetley (rob.wheetley@lcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Progress monitoring data will be utilized to inform instruction. 2. Instruction will be tailored to address standards that are showing deficiencies. 3. The master schedule will provide sufficient time for intensive intervention during the school day. 4. Wonders curriculum was purchased for 21-22 school year to align with ELA B.E.S.T. Standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring will help teachers provide targeted instruction based on students' needs. Intervention time of 30 minutes is built into the daily schedule so teachers, interventionists, and inclusion teachers can work with small groups to remediate targeted students. The new WONDERS curriculum includes supplemental strategies to be used for Tier 2 instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Hold quarterly data chats. These meetings will happen at three different levels: (1) teacher with individual student, (2) member of leadership with individual student; and (3) teacher with leadership team.

Person Responsible	Rob Wheetley (rob.wheetley@lcsb.org)

Intervention courses are included in Tier 2 and Tier 3 student schedules. This 30 minute period will be used to focus on targeted essential skills. Intervention will be provided in small group or individual setting by the general education teacher, interventionist, or inclusion teacher.

Person Responsible	Brenda Green (brenda.green@lcsb.org)

Professional development for WONDERS will continue throughout the school year. The initial training was held in the summer. There are two more sessions to be scheduled for the 21-22 school year.

Person Responsible	Jessica Bennett (jessica.bennett@lcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math proficiency for current 5th graders (last year's 4th grade) was 19%.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the targeted grade level will increase by 20% from the 20-21 STAR Math scores.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring will occur three times per year for all grade groups. Teachers for grades 5th grade will engage in face to face data chats with the principal and school level administration to review progress following each progress monitoring. This group will review data, and problem solve to determine if the strategies for improvement are having the desired impact. Based on the data, instruction will be modified to address identified weaknesses. Students identified for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction will be closely monitored to ensure that interventions are effective and strategies changed as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rob Wheetley (rob.wheetley@lcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Progress monitoring data will be utilized to inform instruction. 2. Instruction will be tailored to address standards that are showing deficiencies. 3. The master schedule will provide sufficient time for intensive intervention during the school day. 4. Go Math! curriculum is used for 5th grade.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 primary area of concern will be suspensions. Suspensions per 100 students is 8.5%. Secondary we will be looking at Drug/public Order incidents at a rate of 0.21% per 100 students. The school culture/ environment will be based around pride and excellence in everything we do. It will be monitored through the FOCUS portal for referrals.

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.

A positive school culture and environment is built through open communication between stakeholders. Teachers and staff regularly communicate with families, volunteers, community and board members through newsletters, Parent Square, social media announcements, local newspaper, etc. Stakeholders are encouraged to participate in school activities and are asked to provide feedback in order to increase student achievement and stakeholder involvement.

A positive behavior plan and school-wide expectations have also been established to create a more positive culture and environment. PAWS-itive expectations are posted throughout the school and are taught and modeled during the year. Students are recognized by earning PAWS for their positive behavior. Once they earn ten PAWS, they earn a small reward.

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

Students: follow school-wide expectations
Teachers/Staff: implement PBS plan and ensure students follow school-wide expectations; participate in problem solving team meetings
Parents: Hold students accountable for following school-wide expectations; participate in problem solving team meetings
Volunteers/Community: provide resources and support for school activities
Board Members: approve policy, ie Code of Conduct, Student Handbook; provide resources and support for school activities

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$123,431.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	General Fund	1.0	$45,000.00

			Notes: Classroom teacher to provide intensive intervention.			
	5100	210-Retirement	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	General Fund		$4,464.00
			Notes: Retirement			
	5100	220-Social Security	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	General Fund		$2,767.00
			Notes: Social Security			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	General Fund		$2,000.00
			Notes: Insurance			
	5100	360-Rentals	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Title, I Part A		$3,200.00
			Notes: Instructional software, Write Score to support ELA instruction.			
	5100	360-Rentals	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Title, I Part A		$20,000.00
			Notes: Technology rental to support reading instruction.			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Title II		$4,000.00
			Notes: Stipends for teachers to participate in professional development for curriculum alignment and ELA B.E.S.T. standards.			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Other Federal		$35,000.00
			Notes: Teacher salary to support reading and math instruction.			
	5100	210-Retirement	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Other Federal		$3,500.00
			Notes: Retirement			
	5100	220-Social Security	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Other Federal		$2,000.00
			Notes: Social Security			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Other Federal		$1,500.00
			Notes: Group Insurance			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$31,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	360-Rentals	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Title, I Part A		$20,000.00
			Notes: Technology rentals to support math instruction.			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Title II		$4,000.00
			Notes: Professional development for teachers in the area of math.			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Title V, Part B	0.3	$5,000.00

	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0031 - W. R. Tolar K 8 School	Title II		$2,000.00
			Notes: Salary for instructional technology coach to assist teachers to become proficient in the use of educational software programs.			
			Notes: Salary for mentor teachers to support new teachers.			
					Total:	**$154,431.00**