

Hernando County School District

# Winding Waters K 8



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

## Winding Waters K 8

12240 VESPA WAY, Weeki Wachee, FL 34614

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/wwk8>

### Demographics

**Principal: Cari O'rourke**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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 Hernando 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

## Winding Waters K 8

12240 VESPA WAY, Weeki Wachee, FL 34614

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/wwk8>

### 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 PK-8	No	90%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

The School mission is to encourage and support teachers and community leaders to work together in order to develop an inspiring and rigorous learning environment that supports the needs of all children.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The School vision is to cultivate an environment for students to reach their maximum potential. Students will be empowered to be risk takers and critical thinkers thereby acquiring the skills and confidence necessary to become lifelong learners and responsible citizens in our global society.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
castoria, lisa	Assistant Principal	Monitoring and support when needed.
Cerro, Janet	Principal	Monitoring and support when needed.
DeArmas, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Monitoring and support when needed.
Gleason, Sheryl	Dean	Monitoring and support when needed.
Giaccone, Flor	School Counselor	
Pagan, Colleen		
Ladd, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Core Team (SBLT) Member for PreK - 2.
D'Avanzo, Kate	Teacher, K-12	Core Team Member (SBLT) for Grades 3 - 5.
Miller, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Core Team member (SBLT) for grades 6 - 8
Johns, Kimberly	Teacher, ESE	Core Team Member (SBLT) for ESE.
Arnold, Heather		Core Team Member (SBLT) for Reading

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Cari O'rourke

**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.*

4

**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.*

25

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

94

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,529

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

17

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

14

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

### 2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified as retainees:**



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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**

Thursday 6/3/2021

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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				52%	70%	61%	52%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	61%	59%	48%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	54%	43%	48%	52%
Math Achievement				59%	70%	62%	58%	68%	61%
Math Learning Gains				59%	58%	59%	61%	63%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	58%	52%	47%	57%	52%
Science Achievement				47%	60%	56%	56%	63%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				74%	83%	78%	80%	82%	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	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	59%	-3%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	52%	-2%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
06	2021					
	2019	53%	52%	1%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
07	2021					
	2019	46%	53%	-7%	52%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2021					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	62%	6%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	62%	-3%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
06	2021					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
07	2021					
	2019	66%	62%	4%	54%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	50%	50%	0%	46%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	48%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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	73%	75%	-2%	71%	2%
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	100%	59%	41%	61%	39%
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.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			



Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

## 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	20	23	20	25	40	44	8	50			
ELL	24	50		18	30						
BLK	38	47		43	60						
HSP	51	43	38	51	48	43	38	74	80		
MUL	33	35		36	43		50				
WHT	48	42	35	51	47	58	49	76	73		
FRL	40	37	33	40	42	53	38	73	66		
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	37	38	31	52	44	33	43			
ELL	21	20		23	36						
BLK	39	50		52	57	50	50				

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	51	45	48	55	59	46	44	72			
MUL	43	71		43	47						
WHT	53	48	44	60	59	52	48	77	42		
FRL	47	46	42	54	57	46	46	69	46		
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	13	39	39	24	41	36	15	63			
ELL	38	40		38	50						
BLK	42	59	55	52	70	58	42				
HSP	47	48	40	45	51	36	38	67			
MUL	57	52		64	65		62				
WHT	53	47	43	59	61	47	58	81	56		
FRL	45	42	38	52	56	44	47	73	39		

### 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	560
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
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	55
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	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
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	47
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 emerges across grade levels include: The percentage of proficiency in math and ELA decreases at the middle level; 3rd grade proficiency in ELA is a strong point for our school; Increasing our grade 5 math and science scores continues to be a challenge.

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

The greatest needs for improvement are increasing proficiency percentages for our Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners; improving overall performance in grades 4 -6 in ELA & 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?

Contributing factors include the fact that our school growth has been stagnant the past few years at certain grade levels and the need to get students ready for success for the next school year. New actions include changing teacher assignments to build stronger Grade Level Teams; recommitting to the Formative process and instituting the expectation of teacher planning components.

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

Progress monitoring using iReady and supporting students with early warning indicators as needed.

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

Using the iReady tool with fidelity so that students were given what they needed based on their growth.

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

Teachers will be expected to plan, deliver, and analyze formative assessments results to determine next steps at each grade level.

#### 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.

Building level coaches, administration, team leaders and department chairs will lead new PD opportunities focused on the Formative Assessment Process and Facilitated Lesson Planning.

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

A focus of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and increased accountability as it pertains to all components of instructional planning will help ensure sustainability of improvement next year and beyond,

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Based on review of data, we are concerned that our growth rate in proficiency has become stagnant the past several years.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our goal is to increase the % of students who are meeting or exceeding the expectations of the Florida standards at each grade level by 10%.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Results from the formative assessments will be monitored including grade level / content area formative chats, administrative data chats, iReady progress monitoring, standards mastery and science monitoring results.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will establish a systematic approach for collaborative review of student work, analyze the standard being assessed and determine appropriate instructional strategies.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	This strategy was selected based on the need for WWK8 to: Have an effective protocol that monitors student understanding of the Florida standards; to assist teachers in choosing appropriate instructional strategies that benefit students.
<b>Action Steps to Implement</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teachers will receive training &amp; support to effectively follow the Lesson Planning Continuum</li> <li>- Teachers will attend Administrative Chats prepared to discuss their data and next steps</li> <li>- Teachers will actively participate in PLC's &amp; engage w/ coaches to improve instructional practice</li> <li>- Core Team Members will look at data and determine trends and possible next steps if goals are not met</li> </ul>	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Small group instruction is effective because teaching is focused precisely on what the students need to learn to move forward,
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Following the administration of AP2, students will achieve 50% of their annual typical growth in both reading and math.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	This Area of Focus will be monitored by classroom teachers (lesson planning & formative assessment results) and by administration (walkthroughs, lesson design and data chats).
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Ongoing and 'active' observation of students, combined with systematic assessment, enables teachers to organize groups of students who fit a particular instructional profile.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The rationale allows for teachers to group students in order to deliver instruction targeted to meet individual student needs.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- MTSS & Small Groups will be determined based on historical data and AP1 at the beginning of year
- Teachers will identify goals within the established groups and monitor students progress
- New groupings will be established based upon the success of their students meeting their goals
- Teachers will use formative assessment and progress monitoring results to make further adjustments if needed so that students are moving towards making at least 50% of typical growth by mid year

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) increases self-awareness in children, academic achievement and positive social interactions.

**Measurable Outcome:** Early warning indicators will decrease by 5% - 15%.

**Monitoring:** This Area of Focus will be monitored at monthly PBiS meetings and at Threat Assessment and MTSS meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Incorporating SEL programs into classrooms that include problem-solving & communication skills while teaching student to embrace diversity will build healthy relationships and self awareness / confidence.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale for selecting SEL as our area of focus is to help our students develop emotional resilience and to increase positive social communications and interactions.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- Action Steps;
- Provide staff with compassion training
  - Provide SEL training to teachers
  - Establishment of a Culture & Communications Team
  - Implement and Monitor SEL strategies

**Person Responsible** Janet Cerro (cerro\_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	We have not met the Federal ESSA requirement of 41% the past two years for SWD and ELL. Meeting our goal will result in our school satisfying the Every Student Succeeds Act requirements.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our most current data for SWD is 38% and 35% for ELL. Our goal is for both subgroups to increase overall performance in ELA & Math by 6% at the end of the 21-22 school year.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	The performance of these subgroups will be monitored by careful analyzation of formative assessment results; iReady progress monitoring;
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will continue to learn how to effectively apply the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Framework within their classrooms in order to support these subgroups.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The rationale for choosing UDL is to assure that a variety of teaching methods are correctly and consistently used to remove any barriers to learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Action Steps are:

- Administration will provide planning time and PD that includes establishing realistic and rigorous lesson planning expectations that meet the needs of all students.
- ESE and General Education inclusion teachers will be provided time to plan and discuss lesson design.
- Administration and instructional coaches will offer support in the classrooms.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]



**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	The percentage of students below Level 3 in fourth & fifth grades on the 19-20 statewide English Arts Assessment was 48%; 42% respectively.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase percentage of fourth & fifth grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide standardized ELA assessment by 5 - 7 percentage points.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	This Area of Focus will be monitored by classroom teachers, Team Leaders and by administration (walkthroughs, lesson design and data chats).
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Janet Cerro (cerro_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Instructional based strategies being implemented to reach the desired outcome include setting objectives and determining the means to achieving the objectives during collaborative planning (Learning Intentions) and using appropriate questioning strategies in the classroom (Feedback).
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	John Hattie's ground-breaking study "Visible Learning" ranked 138 influences that are related to learning outcomes. Each of the strategies listed above have high potential to accelerate student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- Teachers received training & support on how to effectively follow the Lesson Planning Continuum
- Teachers will attend Administrative Chats prepared to discuss their data and next steps
- Teachers will actively participate in PLC's & engage w/ coaches to improve instructional practice
- Core Team Members will look at data and determine trends and possible next steps id goals are not met

**Person Responsible** Janet Cerro (cerro\_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

## 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.

We have created a Culture & Communication Team comprised of numerous stakeholders within the building. This leadership group will identify the areas that they feel need improvement and set goals and expectations for all to meet these goals. This team will meeting twice a month and they will use the problem solving process when faced with obstacles. All WWK8 staff will be expected to actively contribute in growing our school culture; one that values trust, respect and high expectations.

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

Principal Janet Cerro, Assistant Principal Lisa Castoria, Assistant Principal Jennifer de Armas, Dean of Students Sheryl Gleason, Elementary Assistant Jennifer Ladd, Guidance Counselor Flor Giaccone, Guidance Counselor Annie Hinman, Assessment Teacher Joanne Kozlow, Support Staff Debbie Medina, Support Staff Shawn Kekovich Support Staff Paraeducator, Elementary Teri Kallnischkies, Elementary Teacher Carissa Edwards, Elementary Teacher Kristen Wogan, Middle School Teacher Stephanie Riggs, Middle School Teacher Sheree Carman and Middle School Teacher Debbie Torres.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00