Seminole County Public Schools

Wicklow Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|---------------------------------|----|
| Durmage and Quilling of the CID | 4 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Wicklow Elementary School

100 PLACID LAKE DR, Sanford, FL 32773

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0811

Demographics

Principal: Daniel Windish

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| 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) | 88% |
| 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 (60%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (48%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | <u>LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</u> |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For | or more information, click here. |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

- 1. have a school grade of D or F
- 2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
- 3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| · | |
| School Information | 7 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| | |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| | |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Wicklow Elementary School

100 PLACID LAKE DR, Sanford, FL 32773

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0811

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID I | | 711711-71 LITIE I SCHOOL LIISANVANTANEN I | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|---|----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | School | | 83% | | | | | | | | |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) | | | | | | | |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 86% | | | | | | | |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | | | | | | | |
| Grade | | В | В | В | | | | | | | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole 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.

Wicklow Elementary Magnet School for Global Pathways engages all children in a collaborative environment with an inquiry-based approach to develop knowledgeable, caring and internationally-minded scholars. We inspire our scholars to become lifelong learners and creative thinkers who take action to make a positive impact in our world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wicklow Elementary Magnet School for Global Pathways will teach our scholars to become globally-minded citizens and equip them with the strategies, knowledge, and skills needed to pursue excellence in our modern society. Our scholars will explore and connect firsthand with cultures of the world through language immersion, partnerships, and technology. We will teach our students to listen, speak, read, and write in two languages; achieve academic excellence through an international approach, and develop cultural awareness and sensitivity. Wicklow Elementary Magnet School will be the top elementary school in the Northwest Cluster. Our focus on excellence are summed up in a few simple, strategic practices: 1. Support our outstanding students, teachers, and staff. 2. Identify the instructional needs of every student, differentiate our approach, and provide best instructional pedagogical strategies. 3. Create a culture of commitment and excellence in our school that supports our students, staff, and community. Wicklow will support the SCPS vision that all Early Childhood Program and PreK-Grade 12 students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens. All students will perform at the highest levels and the school's personnel will be highly qualified, care about the well-being of every student, diverse, innovative, enthusiastic, and dedicated to the mission of our district and school.

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 |
|--------------------|------------------------|--|
| Windish, Daniel | Principal | My main responsibility is to ensure a safe and supportive learning environment where student achievement is top priority. |
| Archie, Claude | Assistant Principal | Mr. Archie's main responsibility is to ensure a safe learning environment and to support teachers and learning. |
| | | |
| Stone, Carson | Assistant Principal | Mr. Stone's main responsibility is to ensure a safe, learning environment and to support the implementation of the IB/PYP magnet program. |
| Hengehold, Lisa | Other | Mrs. Hengehold's main responsibility is to ensure a safe, learning environment and to support facilities and the daily operations of the school. |
| Gordon, George | Behavior Specialist | Mr. Gordon's main responsibility is to ensure a safe, learning environment and to support teachers in implementing proactive approaches to behavioral disruptions to learning. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Daniel Windish

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.

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

659

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

13

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| la diactor | | | | (| Grac | le Le | vel | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 107 | 116 | 110 | 111 | 99 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 657 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 34 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 14 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 12 | 19 | 16 | 16 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| 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 9/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--|-------------|-------|
| Number of students enrolled | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in ELA | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | | |

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment

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

Indicator Grade Level Total

Students with two or more indicators

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator Grade Level Total

Retained Students: Current Year

Students retained two or more times

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | evel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| 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 | | | | 2019 | 2018 | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|-----------------|-------|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 48% | 67% | 57% | 49% | 63% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 61% | 61% | 58% | 55% | 58% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 71% | 51% | 53% | 54% | 47% | 48% |

| School Grade Component | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | | |
| Math Achievement | | | | 60% | 70% | 63% | 58% | 68% | 62% | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 67% | 66% | 62% | 58% | 62% | 59% | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 62% | 50% | 51% | 57% | 46% | 47% | | |
| Science Achievement | | | | 50% | 62% | 53% | 50% | 66% | 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 | 44% | 67% | -23% | 58% | -14% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 65% | -19% | 58% | -12% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -44% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 64% | -20% | 56% | -12% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -46% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | 1 | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 71% | -14% | 62% | -5% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 72% | -21% | 64% | -13% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -57% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 65% | -5% | 60% | 0% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -51% | | | • | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 62% | -15% | 53% | -6% | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | • | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostic Assessments were utilized to progress monitor*:

- ELA Grades 1-5
- Mathematics Grades 1-5

In Grade 5 Science, teacher based formative assessments were used for progress monitoring. Data is unavailable for these assessments.

*Reported data is based upon having 10 or more students in the subgroup. Less than 10 students will be reported as 0.

| | | Grade 1 | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | | |
| | All Students | 20/20% | 32/30% | 49/44% | | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 16/18% | 24/26% | 41/42% | | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/13% | 2/14% | 3/19% | | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 1/5% | 3/13% | 4/17% | | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | | |
| | All Students | 12/12% | 22/20% | 47/43% | | | | | |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 10/11% | 16/17% | 41/42% | | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 1/4% | 4/17% | | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 1/4% | 4/17% | | | | | |
| Grade 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Grade 2 | | | | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 2 Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 32/29% | Spring 46/43% | | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 24/23% | 32/29% | 46/43% | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 24/23% 18/19% | 32/29% 26/25% | 46/43% 39/39% | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 24/23% 18/19% 4/20% 1/3% Fall | 32/29% 26/25% 1/5% | 46/43% 39/39% 7/37% | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 24/23% 18/19% 4/20% 1/3% | 32/29% 26/25% 1/5% 4/11% | 46/43% 39/39% 7/37% 5/16% | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 24/23% 18/19% 4/20% 1/3% Fall | 32/29% 26/25% 1/5% 4/11% Winter | 46/43% 39/39% 7/37% 5/16% Spring | | | | | |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 24/23% 18/19% 4/20% 1/3% Fall 11/11% | 32/29% 26/25% 1/5% 4/11% Winter 34/33% | 46/43% 39/39% 7/37% 5/16% Spring 56/55% | | | | | |

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 9/9% | 12/12% | 20/20% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 8/9% | 10/11% | 18/20% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 1/7% | 1/6% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 1/3% | 4/14% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 9/9% | 20/20% | 32/33% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 8/9% | 19/20% | 30/33% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 2/13% | 3/20% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | Fall 23/21% | Winter 35/30% | Spring 42/34% |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | | | . • |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 23/21% | 35/30% | 42/34% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 23/21% 15/15% | 35/30% 26/24% | 42/34% 32/29% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | 23/21% 15/15% 0 | 35/30% 26/24% 2/6^ | 42/34% 32/29% 2/6% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | 23/21% 15/15% 0 2/6% | 35/30% 26/24% 2/6^ 4/13% | 42/34% 32/29% 2/6% 2/6% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | 23/21% 15/15% 0 2/6% Fall | 35/30% 26/24% 2/6^ 4/13% Winter | 42/34% 32/29% 2/6% 2/6% Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | 23/21% 15/15% 0 2/6% Fall 21/18% | 35/30% 26/24% 2/6^ 4/13% Winter 37/31% | 42/34% 32/29% 2/6% 2/6% Spring 54/44% |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 22/19% | 36/32% | 48/42% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 15/15% | 28/27% | 38/37% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 2/7% | 4/13% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/7% | 5/17% | 8/27% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 32/29% | 38/34% | 47/42% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 26/27% | 29/29% | 37/37% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6/21% | 4/14% | 6/20% |
| | English Language Learners | 8/29% | 10/33% | 11/37% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 12 | 26 | 33 | 18 | 21 | 13 | 12 | | | | |
| ELL | 18 | 28 | 36 | 30 | 35 | 55 | 6 | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 33 | 38 | 17 | 24 | 14 | 14 | | | | |
| HSP | 32 | 35 | 40 | 36 | 31 | 42 | 18 | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 39 | | 45 | 33 | | 35 | | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 33 | 38 | 29 | 26 | 28 | 19 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 20 | 54 | 68 | 40 | 63 | 61 | 32 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 54 | 60 | 54 | 67 | 56 | 35 | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 58 | 77 | 53 | 67 | 72 | 44 | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 63 | 71 | 64 | 69 | 55 | 47 | | | | |

| | | 2019 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| WHT | 68 | 68 | | 68 | 71 | | 57 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 59 | 71 | 57 | 66 | 60 | 49 | | | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 24 | 40 | 43 | 38 | 60 | 58 | 11 | | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 45 | 41 | 48 | 57 | 62 | 17 | | | | |
| BLK | 46 | 52 | 53 | 60 | 59 | 56 | 55 | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 51 | 52 | 56 | 61 | 67 | 34 | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 66 | 58 | 63 | 52 | | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 54 | 55 | 57 | 59 | 57 | 48 | | | | |

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 | 35 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 62 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 278 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |

Subgroup Data

| 3 mg. 3 mp 2 mm. | | | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| Students With Disabilities | | | | | | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 24 | | | | | |
| 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 | 34 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 34 |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 23 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 37 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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% | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students | |
| | 41 |
| White Students | 41 NO |
| White Students Federal Index - White Students | |
| White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | |
| White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% Economically Disadvantaged Students | NO |

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?

The ELA proficiency across all grade levels is a concerning trend.

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

ELA achievement and learning growth demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Factors contributing to the low ELA performance include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

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

Progress monitoring data reflects improvement in ELA throughout the 2020-21 school year at all grade levels.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards-based tutoring.

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

Acceleration strategies will include strategic monitoring of lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students, more frequent common formative assessment to gather progress monitoring data and highly structured professional learning community discussions using this data to collaborate on strategies to accelerate student learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support; and expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA |
|---|
|---|

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

Improving Reading/ELA instruction for all students. FSA achievement data reflects that less than 50% of students scored a level 3 or above on the 2021 FSA.

Measurable Outcome:

The measurable outcome will be an increase in the percentage of students scoring

level 3 or above on the spring 2022 FSA.

Monitoring:

This area of focus will be monitored through strategic, data aligned PLC planning and collaboration, common formative assessment data, DRA and iReady outcomes.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Windish (daniel_windish@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Research reflects a 0.47 effect size for small group learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By working with students in small groups, teachers can provide targeted lessons and feedback to quickly accelerate student learning through both differentiation in

the core and intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

Developing highly collaborative PLCs strategically focused on the use of formative assessment data. Utilizing results of DRA and iReady diagnostics to design reading acceleration support for students. Utilizing SCPS Early Warning/MTSS systems to support interventions.

Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction.

Utilizing pacing calendars and research based instructional materials and practices in 90-minute block.

Utilizing additional research-based intervention curriculum for tier 2 and 3 students.

See Seminole County Public Schools' School Improvement Plan for additional details.

Person Responsible

Daniel Windish (daniel windish@scps.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Wicklow Elementary reported 0.7 incidents per 100 students. This data falls in the Moderate category.

At Wicklow, we are concerned about the number of out of school suspensions and the number of classroom removals. We are taking a proactive, positive approach to improvement. Teachers and staff are being trained on when behavior support is needed and on our overall approach to positive reinforcement of expected student behavior. Explorer Award tickets are the positive reinforcements used for rewarding students and the number of tickets will be tracked each month. Goals for increasing the number are set for the next month based upon the number from the previous month. For students having limited success with the overall school expectations, individualized positive behavior plans are created to help with the goal of minimizing classroom removals and minimizing out of school suspensions.

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.

Wicklow Elementary Magnet School for Global Pathways works very closely with its students and families with the intent to positively highlight every student's culture, educate and celebrate the differences, which make our school so rich. Wicklow is also an IB/PYP Candidate School. Starting in August, we have several community events and IB/PYP Nights throughout the year including World Language Night, an annual Disney Musical, Book Fairs, Curriculum Nights, Title I sponsored family nights, and PTA events that support our efforts. Our school environment embraces the Spanish language, as many of our families speak Spanish. This can be seen through all home/school communication and marquee announcements. Wicklow has embraced a Dual Language Immersion Program. Working as a collaborative team, kindergarten through fifth grade teachers and Dual Language teachers, teach the English curriculum, Spanish language and culture through a full- immersion model. Other events, such as Teach In, also gives our students the opportunity to share their culture with their peers.

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

Stakeholder groups including teachers, students, families, volunteers, and community members are all involved in

promoting our positive school culture and environment. School events, activities, initiatives are planned proactively and based on feedback and data. We believe the communication at Wicklow is key to the promotion

of our positive climate. Students and teachers receive daily announcements via our "Morning Announcements."

Faculty and Staff receive communications via email twice a week with important announcements and calendar

coordination. Families and community members are sent a Weekly Family Update and can access important

announcements via our social media accounts. This cycle of communication coordinates the stakeholder groups

and provides all with a chance to be a part of our Wicklow Family.