# Wilson Elementary School



# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Wilson Elementary School

## 702 W ENGLISH ST, Plant City, FL 33563

### [ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

## Principal: Kayla Forcucci                    Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: B (56%)<br><br>2018-19: C (41%)<br><br>2017-18: B (59%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | ATSI |
| * 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 Hillsborough 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.](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

# Wilson Elementary School

## 702 W ENGLISH ST, Plant City, FL 33563

## [ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 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 | 73% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | | C | C |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.**

To guide each student to his or her greatest potential.

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

Preparing Students For Life

## School Leadership Team

**Membership**
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Forcucci, Kayla | Principal | |
| Kim, Catherine | Assistant Principal | |
| Jordan, Christine | Instructional Coach | |
| Burnside, Kristin | Instructional Coach | |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Sunday 7/1/2018, Kayla Forcucci

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*
3

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

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

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

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 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 | |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

| 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**

Friday 9/9/2022

**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 | 50 | 49 | 55 | 45 | 47 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 292 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

**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 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | 50 | 49 | 55 | 45 | 47 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 292 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

**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 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 46% | 53% | 56% | | | | 43% | 52% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 58% | | | | | | 44% | 55% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 37% | | | | | | 36% | 50% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 52% | 50% | 50% | | | | 43% | 54% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 75% | | | | | | 41% | 57% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 68% | | | | | | 33% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 54% | 59% | 59% | | | | 44% | 50% | 53% |

**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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 52% | -8% | 58% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 55% | -15% | 58% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -44% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 38% | 54% | -16% | 56% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 54% | -9% | 62% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 57% | -21% | 64% | -28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -45% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 54% | -7% | 60% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 51% | -8% | 53% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 22 | 44 | | 25 | 69 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 45 | 27 | 44 | 70 | 73 | 27 | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 56 | 27 | 52 | 75 | 71 | 52 | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 57 | | 50 | 75 | | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 55 | 33 | 49 | 72 | 67 | 46 | | | | |

| 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 | 12 | | | 16 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 42 | | 38 | 40 | | 35 | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 38 | 31 | 39 | 29 | 20 | 33 | | | | |
| WHT | 37 | 42 | | 39 | 54 | | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 40 | 40 | 41 | 35 | 8 | 39 | | | | |
| 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 | 32 | 36 | | 44 | 43 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 35 | 36 | 40 | 38 | 42 | 39 | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | | | 55 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 36 | 41 | 35 | 39 | 38 | 35 | 45 | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 54 | | 44 | 42 | | 55 | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 41 | 33 | 39 | 40 | 35 | 39 | | | | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 65 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 455 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 40 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 49 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| 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% | 0 |

| 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% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 56 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| 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% | 0 |

| 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% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 57 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 54 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**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?**

Over the course of the 21-22 school year we noticed students in primary grades were struggling to keep focus and make consistent gains. We also noticed the 3rd graders were significantly behind the performance level expected. Our 4th graders were all being taught by experienced 4th grade teachers who actively participated in planning and PLC but the student achievement for 4th grade ELA continued to be minimal. 5th grade data tended show a continual increase.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Reading proficiency at 46%, which is an increase, but we want this to be 50% or greater. Our BQ gains for ELA are significantly below 50%.

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

Both Reading proficiency and BQ ELA Proficiency were gains last year. We need to continue the inquiry cycles we began las year to continue to address student achievement.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Math across all progress monitoring cells was an increase. Math BQ was the greatest increase.

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

Our math coach worked consistently to plan and unpack standards with grade 3-5 teachers. We help multiple cycles of inquiry across the year specifically addressing the trends we saw with math instruction and student performance.

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

Identifying students for acceleration and continuing cycles of inquiry.

**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.**

Florida BEST Standard Dive for ELA, with Dee Toler, St. of Florida
Student Ownership, with Barbara Knox, HCPS Math DRT
Florida BEST Standard Dive for Math, with HCPS B. Knox and C. King Math Instructional Coach

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

We will conduct an instructional review in October with the assistance of district support staff. Cycles of Inquiry will be developed based on the trends seen through this review. PD and feedback will be based on the cycle.

**Areas of Focus**
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | BEST standards are being implemented across K-5 for the first time this year. The Wonders curriculum we are using to support teaching these standards is new to Grades 3-5 this year. STEM scopes is the new curriculum being used to address the BEST Math Standards. Our teachers both new and experienced are all growing their understanding of the BEST Standards and their efficiency with using the new curriculum materials. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | By Spring of 2023 students will demonstrate 49% (ELA), 52% (Math) and (60%) Science proficiency on the 2023 Spring FAST PMA3. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | ELA: Use the PMAs for FAST, Spotlight checkpoints and unit assessments from Wonders, iReady<br>Math: iReady and Math Quarterlies<br>Science: Baseline/MidTerm and quarterly assessments<br>In addition, informal formative assessments will be used on a daily/weekly basis. Teachers will plan "checks for understanding" to make lesson adjustments and plan for small groups. (reteach, accelerate, enrich) |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | *Daily implementation of independent thinking routines will be used in lessons across content.<br>*Grade level teams will plan with instructional coaches to support content knowledge and development of questions, tasks, and assessments that yield data that allow the teacher to assess progress toward learning outcomes and provide for lesson adjustment. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | *Visible thinking is about teaching students "thinking routines" to improve thinking and comprehension abilities. By making thinking visible students can discuss and reflect on their own thinking, as well as, the thinking of their peers. |

### Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Present BEST standards study dive, priorities and independent thinking routines to staff.

| **Person Responsible** | Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

Plan with coaches to strengthen content knowledge and thinking routines.

**Person Responsible**    Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@hcps.net)

Weekly look-for thinking routines in classroom lessons. Provide feedback on implementation of strategies and results visible.

**Person Responsible**    Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

## #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | SWD fell below the federal index of 41%. Last year we began the year with only one ESE teacher to help support students IEP goals. An additional teacher was hired mid year and schedules were adjusted to provide greater support to students with disabilities. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | By Spring of 2023, students in the SWD subgroup will have an overall federal index over 41%. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | ELA progress monitored through iReady diagnostic, Spotlight checks, and unit assessments. Math progress monitoring through iReady diagnostics, math quarterlies. Science progress monitoring through quarterly assessments. Quarterly IEP reviews with VE and Gen Ed teachers. VE Teachers attend planning sessions with grade levels served. In addition, informal informative assessments will be used on a daily/weekly basis. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | *Daily implementation of independent thinking routines will be used in lessons across content. <br> *Grade level teams will plan with instructional coaches to support content knowledge and development of questions, tasks, and assessments that yield data that allow the teacher to assess student progress toward learning outcomes and provide for lesson adjustments. VE teachers will be part of these sessions and advocate for the needs of VE students in the planning session. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | Visible thinking is about students "thinking routines" to improve thinking and comprehension abilities. By making thinking visible, students can discuss and reflect on their own thinking as well as the thinking of their peers. |

## Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Weekly look-for thinking routines in classroom lessons. Provide feedback on implementing of strategies and results visible.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net) |

Plan with coaches to strengthen content knowledge and select thinking routines.

**Person Responsible**     Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@hcps.net)

Meet quarterly with leadership to review student progress toward gains and proficiency.

**Person Responsible**     Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The percentage of students scoring on grade level on the end-of-year view of iReady diagnostic in May was 39%.
Kindergarten: 60%
Grade 1: 34%
Grade 2: 24%

### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The percentage of students scoring 3 and above on the 2022 statewide, ELA assessment was 46%. This was an increase from the year prior.

**Measurable Outcomes:**
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

### Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

By Spring of 2023, 50% of our students in grades K-2 will perform at grade level according to the EOY Diagnostic of iReady.

### Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By Spring of 2023, 50% of our students in grades 3-5 will score proficiently on the statewide FAST assessment.

**Monitoring:**
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Observation of instruction and feedback to instructional staff: Regular walk-throughs will take place and teachers will receive feedback on instructional practices related to moving students to proficiency.
Monitoring FAST progress for grades 3-5: "Count" rosters will be organized so teachers are aware of students who will "count" toward the proficiency (Oct 14th). FAST assessments and other ELA assessments will be logged and reviewed in quarterly data chats.
Monitoring iReady progress for grades K-2: Primary reading tutoring will be offered for students needing extra instruction outside of classroom time. Student progress will be monitored thru data chats in quarterly meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Forcucci, Kayla, kayla.forcucci@hcps.net

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

*Team planning: Grade level teams will plan with ELA or Admin to look specifically at the Benchmark and determine the strategy that will best support student learning.
*Explicit Modeling: When teachers explicitly model the strategy and produce and exemplar, students then know what is expected and will be able to meet expectations.
*Implementing purposeful questions, tasks, and assessments aligned to standards: When these components align with the rigor of the Benchmark then students are given the opportunity to perform grade level work and student achievement will more likely reflect proficiency.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

In 2022, the data showed students struggled to be proficient with grade level standards. The improvement strategy of team planning, explicit modeling, and implementing purposeful questions. tasks, and assessments aligned to benchmarks will yield evidence of student learning.

**Action Steps to Implement:**
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| Literacy Coaching: Meet with school site coach to conduct a "planning for planning" session using the backward design model. During the session, the district resource teacher and site coach will plan a lesson with the end in mind while creating questions to support teachers in having a clear understanding of the questions, tasks, and assessments. | Burnside, Kristin, kristin.burnside@hcps.net |
| Collaboration: Collaborate with teachers during weekly planning session to focus on the following components of the backward planning model: creating the mini assessment, creating benchmark based tasks to provide opportunities to students to demonstrate learning and craft purposeful questions to encourage student discourse around the content while applying the strategy to meet the demands of the benchmark. | Burnside, Kristin, kristin.burnside@hcps.net |
| Identify teachers to engage in job embedded coteaching professional development utilizing the lesson study model. | Kim, Catherine, catherine.kim@hcps.net |
| Embed professional development around modeling of reading strategies to support reading behaviors during current collaborative planning sessions each week. | Burnside, Kristin, kristin.burnside@hcps.net |

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Wilson's Wildcats of Honor program is based in citizenship and patriotism. Our character development plan is established thorough a house system based on 4 character traits: Courage, Integrity, Commitment, and Giving. We have the "Essential 15" actions which support our 3R's. Teachers use these essentials throughout the classroom and school so expectations are clear and consistent through out the campus. Students are rewarded for displaying the Essentials/3Rs and encouraged to build up each other when they see them following them. These schoolwide essentials are visible to all students, parents, and visitors.

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

All staff are involved in modeling, promoting, and reinforcing the essentials. They award daily points for students seen demonstrating behaviors. Monthly recognition for the lead house is done during the cafeteria lunch time. Business partners contribute to the treats given for the monthly awards and contribute to suggestions during the SAC.