Sumter District Schools

Webster Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Webster Elementary School

349 S MARKET BLVD, Webster, FL 33597

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Furlong

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Sumter 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

Webster Elementary School

349 S MARKET BLVD, Webster, FL 33597

[no web address on file]

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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

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 Sumter 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.

Webster Elementary School, teachers, staff, students, parents and community work as a team to enable all children to reach their potential for future successes by instilling organizational foundations through rigorous based instruction by providing engaging experiences which will maximize the growth of each student and staff member in a safe, challenging environment necessary for college, careers, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Webster Elementary School's vision is to empower students to work as a partnership with staff, parents, and community to discover their strengths and achieve their maximum potential. Webster Elementary School is "Where Everyone Shines!"

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
Shea, Melynda	Principal	
Furlong, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Strickland, Deanna	Assistant Principal	
Smith, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Mears, Jennifer	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Lovett, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Haugabrook, Melani	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Nave, Allison	School Counselor	
Piwowar, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Furtado, Peggy	Teacher, K-12	
Moreland, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	
Ugur, Aysegul	Instructional Media	
Parker, Amanda	Math Coach	
Berry, Shannon	Other	
Lanier, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	
Brannen, Christina	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Mancini, Leslie	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/1/2020, Jessica Furlong

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.*

0

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

592

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

7

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

7

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	102	123	93	91	93	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591
Attendance below 90 percent	18	35	12	11	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	4	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	2	3	5	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	7	11	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	8	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

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	103	88	86	95	75	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	13	11	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	2	8	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	2	6	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	6	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	5	6	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	103	88	86	95	75	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	13	11	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	2	8	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	2	6	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	6	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	5	6	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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				45%	56%	57%	57%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	58%	58%	56%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	51%	53%	61%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				47%	61%	63%	56%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	68%	62%	46%	53%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	55%	51%	44%	45%	47%
Science Achievement				72%	62%	53%	65%	65%	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%	66%	-14%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	62%	-27%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	65%	-15%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	41%	64%	-23%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	72%	-25%	64%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	69%	-19%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	69%	66%	3%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Math/Reading K-5

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/21%	29/35%	46/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/21%	29/35%	46/53%
	Students With Disabilities	5/32%	7/44%	9/53%
	English Language Learners	2/17%	1/17%	4/67%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/10%	14/17%	40/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/10%	14/17%	40/46%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	7/44%	12/71%
	English Language Learners	0	0/0%	2/33%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/20%	25/31%	38/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/20%	25/31%	38/45%
	Students With Disabilities	2/16%	3/20%	7/44%
	English Language Learners	2/16%	4/36%	3/23%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/14%	14/17%	26/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/14%	14/17%	26/31%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8%	2/13%	4/25%
	English Language Learners	2/16%	4/25%	5/38%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39/46%	27/28%	41/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39/46%	27/28%	41/42%
	Students With Disabilities	2/14%	0/0%	3/18%
	English Language Learners	3/19%	1/6%	1/6%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/16%	17/17%	50/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/16%	17/17%	50/52%
	Students With Disabilities	0	3/24%	5/33%
	English Language Learners	2/13%	1/6%	5/29%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26/35%	19/23%	24/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/35%	19/23%	24/30%
	Students With Disabilities	3/21%	1/6%	3/21%
	English Language Learners	2/22%	2/18%	1/8%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/15%	9/11%	30/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/15%	37/43%	30/38%
	Students With Disabilities	1/7%	1/6%	5/38%
	English Language Learners	3/30%	0/0%	4/36%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/20%	12/15%	13/16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/20%	12/15%	13/16%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	1/6%	1/8%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/12%	17/20%	33/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/12%	17/20%	33/40%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/6%	1/7%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0%	1/20%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	68%	53%
	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

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	35	38		45	38		22				
ELL	31			57							
BLK	43			52							
HSP	47	50		64	80						
WHT	58	60		68	67	20	65				
FRL	50	44	58	59	62	41	49				

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	14	34	37	24	52	44	41				
ELL	43	48	50	43	52	40	75				
BLK	38	46		42	54						
HSP	44	51	60	44	57	45	68				

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
MUL	33	36		40	36						
WHT	47	49	48	48	55	43	75				
FRL	41	42	46	41	49	38	70				

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	34	54	44	37	46	57	63				
ELL	35	58	60	32	32	40					
BLK	42	44		48	47		50				
HSP	52	52	64	52	45	25	61				
MUL	59			53							
WHT	60	58	66	57	46	48	69				
FRL	54	55	60	52	44	44	63				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	23
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	48
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	53
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	48
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?

It is evident that grade 3 scored higher levels of proficiency in both FSA Math and FSA ELA than other grade levels.
FSA Math proficiency is higher at all grade levels than FSA ELA proficiency.
ELL learners are achieving proficiency at a much lower rate than other subgroups across all grade levels.
Students With Disabilities performed below their peers in both FSA ELA and FSA Math in most grade levels.
I-Ready progress monitoring data showed that grades 4 and 5 had the smallest number of students meeting proficiency in ELA and 2nd and 4th in Math.
There was a decrease in students meeting proficiency in SSA Science from the 2019 school year to the 2021 school year.

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

Grade 5 ELA instruction shows the greatest need for improvement with 49% of students scoring in the proficient range on 2021 FSA and only 16% proficient on progress monitoring.
Grade 4 2021 Math FSA scores show 55% of students scoring in the proficient range. 2021 Bottom Quartile Learning Gains in Math are only 39%. Progress monitoring data revealed that grade 2 Math needs improvement with 31% of students reaching proficiency.

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

Some contributing factors include: (1) school closure spring 2020 during which students were not learning at the same rate as in-class learning; (2) 2020-2021 class quarantines; (3) many parents chose to enroll in TeamSumter for at least one quarter, the newness of this delivery system caused learning delays at the beginning of the year; (4) an increased number of students that missed more than 10% of schooling; (5) less parental involvement due to COVID procedures; (6) limited volunteers due to COVID procedures; (7) student and teacher quarantines- specifically, our grade 5 teachers were quarantined at least six weeks.
New Action to address the need for improvement include: (1) Surgical quarantines as opposed to whole-class quarantines; (2) Attendance incentives and the marking of quarantined students as "Q" instead of codes that count as absences; (3) grant funding used to supply an 8-hour school day as a means of providing more support and intervention; (4) Acceleration Team initiative allows administration, instructional coaches and interventionists to identify and provide intervention and acceleration for students who are not scoring on-grade-level in i-Ready Diagnostics; (5) Centering PLCs around grade-level and content specific focus: K-3 Math in Numbers and Operations, 4-5 Math in Geometry, K-2 ELA in Phonics, and K-5 ELA in Vocabulary; (6) grant funding used to hire additional staff: Math and ELA Interventionists working with targeted lists of students in need of acceleration; (7) renewed focus on MTSS.

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

Grade 4 FSA ELA data showed an increase in student proficiency from 36% in 2019 to 55% in 2021.
Grade 3 FSA Math data showed an increase in student proficiency from 42% in 2019 to 72% in 2021.
Learning Gains in grades 3-5 FSA ELA from 49%-52% and FSA Math from 55% to 66%.
Bottom Quartile learning gains in grades 3-5 FSA ELA increased from 51% to 65%;
Progress Monitoring within the school year showed grades 1 and 2 ELA earning the greatest increase from Fall to Spring assessments (Grade 1 from 21%-53%; Grade 2 from 20% to 45%). Grade 1 Math showed the largest increase in proficiency from Fall (10%) to Spring (46%).
Gains in proficiency in math are larger than ELA school-wide.

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

Contributing factors to improvement included: (1) PLCs focused on data driven instruction and making adjustments based on real-time progress; (2) standards mastery assessments; (3) staffing adjustments to support student achievement.

New Actions taken at WES in the 2020-2021 school year: (1) Fidelity to i-Ready program by meeting required instructional time; (2) began MasterMinds program (21st Century Learning Grant) full school day; (3) iXL used in 3rd-5th grade to help with computational fluency.

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

Strategies to accelerate learning: (1) Increased small-group instruction based on progress monitoring data in both reading and math; (2) small group instruction to focus heavily on previewing and scaffolding; (3) increased focus on phonics instruction in K-3 and Vocabulary instruction K-5 across all content areas; (4) increased focus on math fluency and focused implementation of Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards. (5) ELA PLCs continue to focus on data driven instruction of BEST standards with the new HMH reading series (6)Math PLCs to focus on data driven instruction and increased use of technology.

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) BEST standards training; (2)Summer Literacy Institute- Reading Coach sharing learned strategies during PLCs; (3) identifying Model Classrooms for teachers to see best practices at work; (4) weekly professional development in PLCs based on the needs of that learning community; (5) school-based PD Day: BEST Attacking the Stack, AVID Academic Language & Literacy, Content-specific vocabulary training for Math teachers; (6) Learning Focused Solutions; (7) i-Ready trainings

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

Additional services to ensure sustainability are our (1) use of grant funding for an 8-hour school day to provide students with acceleration; (2) Acceleration Team including new positions for interventionists and the focus of this team on identifying and meeting the needs of students working below grade-level.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Proficiency on the FSA is below district proficiency levels for grades 3-5. 2021 End-of-Year i-Ready results show only 43% of our students were on grade level in Reading. Only 42% of our K-2 students were on grade level for Phonics Instruction. Only 36% of our K-5 students were on grade level for Vocabulary instruction. For grades K-2 Phonics instruction will be a primary focus with vocabulary as a secondary focus. In grades 3-5 Vocabulary development will be a primary focus across all content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 from 53% to 62%. Increase ELA Learning Gains in grades 3-5 from 52%-62%. Increase ELA BQ LG in grades 3-5 from 65% to 69%. Increase i-Ready outcomes to 62% of students on grade level in Reading. Increase K-2 Phonics instruction outcomes to 62% on grade level. Increase K-5 Vocabulary instruction outcomes to 50% on grade level.
Monitoring:	Phonics (K-2) and Vocabulary (K-5) will be monitored through classroom assessments, discussed during Professional Learning Community meetings, as well as i-Ready Diagnostic assessments administered three times per year. Additionally, our ELA Interventionist & Reading Coach will work with small groups of students to provide targeted instruction in the needed areas, and will discuss progress toward these goals at Acceleration Team Meetings. School-based and District-Level walkthroughs will be used to evaluate the quality of instruction in both Phonics (K-3) and Vocabulary (K-5). Utilize a multi-tiered system of supports to provide targeted instruction and monitor individual student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deanna Strickland (deanna.strickland@sumter.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small-group instruction by classroom teachers as well as interventionists for students identified on our acceleration list. Instruction will focus on previewing and scaffolding the standards to be taught the next week as well as specific vocabulary pertinent to the standard or lesson. In grade K-2, small groups will focus on intervention in phonics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie's Influence on Student Achievement shows that small-group instruction improves student achievement by an effect size of .47.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Include i-Ready time for each teacher in the master schedule.
2. Common Planning time in the master schedule for all grade levels for weekly PLCs.
3. Participate in yearly i-Ready professional development.
4. Utilize grade level and content specific PLC time for data discussions as well as professional learning about best practices.
5. Teachers will work to meet students' needs based on data through the use of whole group and small group instruction.
6. Teachers will monitor i-Ready lessons and the percentage of lessons passed each week.
7. Focus on Tier 2 vocabulary. Utilize research based instructional routines to introduce new tier 2 vocabulary.

8. Continued use of WICOR strategies and writing across content areas.
9. Writing block built into the master schedule.
10. Literacy Coach and Literacy Interventionist work together to provide targeted small group instruction and support classroom teachers.
11. Core Connections writing training.
12. Monitor weekly lesson plans
13. Targeted intervention groups
14. Use of MyOn digital reading tool.
15. Continued use of Accelerated Reader.
16. Increased intervention in MasterMinds classes using Voyager Passport.
17. Monthly Acceleration Team Meetings.
18. Monthly MTSS Data Chats with individual teachers.
19. Teachers will utilize reading series: HMH with fidelity for Tier One instruction.

Person Responsible	Deanna Strickland (deanna.strickland@sumter.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While FSA Math proficiency data showed that we were above the state and district, our end-of-year i-Ready K-5 data shows that only 47% of our students were on grade level. Webster Elementary School's K-3 Math focus is Numbers and Operations and 4-5 is Geometry. This area was originally identified using end-of-year i-Ready data, and was also compared to FSA data. The WES Acceleration Team determined that many students were having difficulty determining the correct way to answer math questions because of a lack of domain specific vocabulary knowledge.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase FSA Math proficiency from 65% to 69% in grades 3-5. Increase FSA Math learning gains from 66% to 70% in grades 3-5. Increase Bottom Quartile FSA Math learning gains from 39% to 50% in grades 3-5. By the end-of-year i-Ready diagnostic, WES students in grade K-5 will show that 62% of our students are on grade level. By the end-of-year i-Ready diagnostic, WES students in grades K-3 will show that 60% of students will be on grade level in Numbers and Operations. By the end-of-year i-Ready diagnostic, WES students in grades 4-5 will show that 50% of students will be on grade level in Geometry.
Monitoring:	The WES Acceleration Team will use beginning-of-year, mid-year, and end-of-year diagnostics by student, class, and grade level to monitor progress and determine students for acceleration groups. Teachers will monitor student lessons and utilize formative assessments to anticipate needs and success. Data will be regularly discussed in Professional Learning Communities and Acceleration Team Meetings. School-based and District-Level walkthroughs will be used to evaluate the quality of instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Furlong (jessica.furlong@sumter.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math interventionists will be utilizing small-group instruction with flexible grouping to preview and review specific skills for students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie's Influence on Student Achievement shows that small-group instruction improves student achievement by an effect size of .47.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Include i-Ready time for each teacher in the master schedule.
2. Common planning time in the master schedule for all grade levels for weekly PLCs.
3. Participate in yearly i-Ready professional development.
4. Utilize grade-level and content specific PLC time for data discussions as well as professional learning about best practices.
5. Teachers will work to meet students' needs based on data through the use of whole group and small group instruction.
6. Teachers will monitor i-Ready lessons and the percentage of lessons passed each week.
7. Focus on domain specific vocabulary.
8. Continued use of WICOR strategies and writing across content areas.
9. Targeted intervention groups.
10. Purchase of IXL Math for 4th & 5th grade.
11. Increased intervention in MasterMinds classes using V-Math Live.

12. Monthly Acceleration Team Meetings.
13. Monthly MTSS Data Chats with individual teachers.

Person Responsible	Jessica Furlong (jessica.furlong@sumter.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Webster Elementary will increase science proficiency in grade 5. Science proficiency on the SSA is below District average for proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase science proficiency from 60% to 72% in grade 5.
Monitoring:	Teachers will monitor student lessons to anticipate needs and success. Data from USA Test Prep will be regularly discussed in Professional Learning Communities. School-based and District-Level walkthroughs will be used to evaluate the quality of instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melynda Shea (melynda.shea@sumter.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through the use of research based science curriculum and ongoing progress monitoring of student assessment data through USA Test Prep, teachers and administrators will work to integrate science text into reading where possible.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	USA Test Prep is a digital tool that is engaging for students, is aligned to state standards, and tracks student performance. This data will help teachers make instructional decisions based on their achievement levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. USA Test Prep
2. Generation Genius
3. Science Labs
4. Writing across content areas
5. "Stop, Drop, Science" Program
6. Science Superstars program
7. Administrative Walkthroughs [add to math & ELA]
8. WICOR Strategies
9. Monthly science data discussion in PLCs
10. Lego League Jr. Club
11. STEAM Night
12. Science Fair
13. Opening MakerSpace for classes
14. Increased hands-on activities in 3rd & 4th grade.

Person Responsible	Melynda Shea (melynda.shea@sumter.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Disruptive behavior interferes with the learning environment by preventing students from learning. Last school year WES processed 55 long forms. Students were sent to AE for time out 448 times in the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of long forms to no more than 50. Decrease the number of times students were sent to AE to no more than 400.
Monitoring:	School administration will monitor the number of students and frequency of which students are assigned to the AE room. School administration will also monitor the number of long forms. Administrative Walkthroughs will also be used to monitor student behavior and teacher implementation of grade-level classroom expectations and hierarchy of consequences.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Furlong (jessica.furlong@sumter.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The schoolwide Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) includes the student expectations represented by the acronym SHINES. Students recite the SHINES pledge daily, and the elements of the SHINES pledge are displayed prominently on the sidewalk. Teachers worked together to develop grade level discipline plans. These plans are aligned with the school wide expectations (SHINES). Teachers reward students for exemplary SHINES behavior and assign consequences when SHINES behavior standards are not met.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS has been shown to work to improve student behavior through the recognition of expected behaviors. John Hattie's Influences on Student Achievement shows that Classroom Management has an effect size of .35, which means it is likely to have a positive effect on student achievement, and Behavioral Intervention Program has an effect size of .62, which means that it has the potential to accelerate student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students recite the SHINES pledge each morning.
2. Sanford Harmony Curriculum
3. School wide mentoring program
4. Lessons from the guidance counselor
5. PBIS team meets monthly to discuss and plan for the PBIS store and treat days where students spend their PBIS money.
6. Administrative Walkthroughs
7. Threat Assessment Team monthly meetings
8. Discipline Data Chats during Monthly Acceleration Team Meeting

Person Responsible	Jessica Furlong (jessica.furlong@sumter.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with higher attendance achieve higher academic success. WES had an average daily attendance of 93.46% in the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase daily attendance average to 95%.
Monitoring:	To monitor attendance, the attendance intern will review the weekly attendance report and call parents whose students have unexcused absences. Teachers are encouraged to call parents if the student is absent more than one day in a week, except where parents have notified the school that the student will be absent or the student is quarantined.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deanna Strickland (deanna.strickland@sumter.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School administration will use tiered support interventions to increase student attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reducing the number of students who have missed more than 10% of school days.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Quarterly awards for perfect attendance.
2. Use of weekly attendance mentors for students that miss between 10-20% of school days.
3. Use of daily attendance mentors for students that miss more than 20% of school days.
4. Referral to Youth and Family Alternatives for mentoring and goal setting.
5. Use of school resource officer for home visits.
7. Weekly automated reports from Skyward to track data.

Person Responsible	Deanna Strickland (deanna.strickland@sumter.k12.fl.us)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Parent Involvement has the potential to accelerate student achievement according to John Hattie's Influences on Student Achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of parents will communicate with their child's teacher at least once per quarter.
Monitoring:	Parental involvement will be monitored through the use of the parent and teacher communication logs that are stored by each teacher in the OneNote staff notebook. The assistant principal will collect this data each quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Furlong (jessica.furlong@sumter.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Planned teacher-parent communication regarding the student's progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie's research on effect size in education shows that parental involvement has an effect size of .50. Parental involvement can impact student learning in a positive manner and contribute to academic success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will complete communication logs to show how often and with who, they are communicating each quarter.
2. The assistant principal will record information in a spreadsheet to show the percentages of parent communication for each class.
3. Use of the Remind communication system.
4. Monthly parent newsletters will go home to inform parents of school events.
5. Each child will use a daily planner that will serve as a form of communication for notes, student grades, goals that are set, data, etc.
6. Parent conference nights.

Person Responsible	Jessica Furlong (jessica.furlong@sumter.k12.fl.us)

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.

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.

Webster Elementary School encourages a positive school culture among students through (1) attendance education and incentives; (2) mentoring students through the use of: a multi-year adult mentor relationship, reciting the Sunshine Pledge daily, modeling the correct use of planners and organizational strategies, using the Sanford Harmony character education program; (3) anti-bullying education; (4) explicit instruction of character education standards across curriculums; (5) Sunshine Scholars monthly recognition of students who are demonstrating the traits of the Sunshine Pledge; (6) Positive Behavior Support plan which includes students earning Sunshine Dollars and spending those dollars for class incentives or monthly Treat Days; and (7) daily Moment of Silence to encourage self-reflection.
Webster Elementary encourages a positive school culture among faculty and staff through (1) our continued vision for collective efficacy among staff members; (2) continued dedication to the FISH! principles; (3) weekly Grade Level Chairs meetings to discuss topics of importance to all faculty as well as give teachers a voice in sharing concerns or ideas; and (4) monthly Sunshine Celebrations to celebrate special occasions, continued hard work and success, and engage in team building through fellowship.
Webster Elementary encourages a positive school culture in our community through our (1) School Advisory Council (SAC) that is comprised of teachers, parents, community partners, school board members, students, and non-instructional staff members. The SAC meets quarterly and shares information about what is happening at the school. Members are encouraged to provide feedback and collaborate with the school.
(2) WES extends positive school culture through utilization of social media to increase awareness of school programs and share our successes and sunshine moments with the community. (3) Parent, Family & Engagement Plan- email Jessica & Mancini.

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

All faculty and staff, students, parents, and community members are stakeholders in promoting a positive school culture. Every stakeholder should encourage the positivity of the culture in their interactions with students, parents, community partners, and with fellow employees.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00