R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

5500 YATES RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

http://schools.polk-fl.net/rbw

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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

R. Bruce Wagner Elementary School

5500 YATES RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

http://schools.polk-fl.net/rbw

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	60%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

We will ensure learning takes place for all through high expectations, family involvement, and instruction rich in communication and technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students, families, and staff work hand in hand to develop responsible, respectful, reliable, lifelong learners . . . every child, every family, every day..."Everything begins with an idea!"

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
Miller , Christopher	Principal	
Williams, Rashawn	Assistant Principal	
Allen, Marieka	Instructional Coach	
Irwin, Meredith	Instructional Coach	
Guptill, Erin	Instructional Coach	
Marolda, Denise	Instructional Coach	
Samples, Angela	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/20/2022, Christopher Miller

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.*
2

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
60

Total number of students enrolled at the school
950

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
11

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	161	158	143	150	136	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	904
Attendance below 90 percent	54	49	35	46	30	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249
One or more suspensions	7	4	3	10	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	29	25	39	14	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
Course failure in Math	0	12	14	28	8	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	48	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	38	36	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	39	67	44	23	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188

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	25	20	20	27	43	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183

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	2	4	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 6/20/2022

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	88	133	128	122	118	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	729
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	28	24	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	49	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	37	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	39	22	52	58	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227

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	2	3	14	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	3	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	88	133	128	122	118	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	729
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	28	24	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	49	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	37	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	39	22	52	58	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227

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	2	3	14	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	3	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	48%	47%	56%				50%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						47%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						37%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	51%	42%	50%				60%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	52%						59%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						45%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	49%	59%				51%	47%	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	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	48%	-9%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	56%	-12%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	49%	45%	4%	53%	-4%
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	46	43	22	33	36	29				
ELL	23	58	68	30	56	48	18				
BLK	50	42		45	43		40				
HSP	39	57	66	44	50	41	29				
MUL	40			55							
WHT	56	60	33	59	55	33	55				
FRL	38	52	53	44	49	43	29				

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	21	38	54	33	50	45	14				
ELL	24	38	43	34	48	42	16				
BLK	25	40		31	33		8				
HSP	35	39	47	46	58	53	36				
WHT	50	36		69	61		53				
FRL	32	37	50	43	46	55	21				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	30	32	40	49	39	29				
ELL	22	34	30	44	51	63	18				
BLK	35	39	31	40	55	43	46				
HSP	43	45	30	55	55	46	35				
WHT	60	50	50	69	63	50	63				
FRL	40	46	38	54	55	42	43				

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	49
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
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	45
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?

Trends that emerge across grade levels show increases in ELA student achievement in grades 3-5. Students with disabilities are performing below 41%. Student performance in math has maintained 50% between 3rd and 4th grade cohorts. 5th grade cohort of students dropped in proficiency from 2021 to 2022. Overall increased in ELA are 18 points. Math overall decreased by 14 points. Trends in primary grades mock the intermediate grade levels in ELA. Math data for primary grades indicates growth in proficiency.

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

Analyzing schoolwide progress monitoring data, primary reading data indicates a need for growth. In primary grades, many students in 1st and 2nd grade are still testing within STAR Early Literacy (did not make the 852 scale score). In addition, our students with disabilities performed lower than any other subgroup. Analyzing state data, math performance decreased from 2021 to 2022. Overall decrease of proficiency in Math indicates a need to restructure. Science data indicates stagnant growth between 2021 and 2022 resulting in the same proficiency score.

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

When reflecting on our need for improvement, contributing factors were:
1. ESE staff to handle the caseload of students
2. Lack of consistent scheduling for staff and students with disabilities
3. Hiring of new teaching staff creating additional units/maintaining consistent instructional staff for the year
4. Influx of student enrollment (mid-year)
5. Inconsistent progress monitoring with tier 2 and tier 3 students (small groups)

New actions the school will implementing to address our need for improvement is adding an additional staff member to oversee MTSS progress monitoring, ESE teachers will participate in grade level planning, ESE teachers are analyzing data and planning for instruction, and implementing a supportive, collaborative culture that fosters a positive environment that encourages staff attendance and retention.

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

Components that showed the most improvement were ELA overall proficiency and ELA Learning gains.

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

The factors that contributing to this improvement implementing a reading initiative using Accelerated Reader, monitoring of small group instruction in ELA, professional development in small group instruction, implementation of STEM creating ownership over instruction, more highly effective and effective teachers instruction math, implementation of reading strategies in Science, and more focused family nights.

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

Strategies needed to be implemented in order to accelerate learning are small group instruction (ELA and Math), implementation of diagnostic assessments to target weakness and strengths, analyzing state standards (Learning Arc), targeted coaching for teachers, peer observations, vertical grade level walks, continued implementation of STEM, and targeted student intervention (para and interventionist).

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.

The professional development the school will engage in this year is the dissection of the Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T) with Professional Learning Communities using the Arc framework. This study will allow all teachers to better understand the intention of the benchmarks. Additionally, we will continue to learn, refine, and implement the STEM initiative to further develop our knowledge for hands on problem solving.

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

The continuation of differentiation through small group instruction, dissection of the B.E.S.T. benchmarks through the learning Arc framework, and the STEM initiative all ensure sustainability of improvement for our immediate future.

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 Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Data is indicating achievement gaps among our subgroup, especially our students with disabilities. Progress monitoring from the 2021-2022 school year indicates a decreased in student proficiency in the area of Math. In order to increase student proficiency, differentiated small group instruction along with MTSS documentation must be implemented with fidelity to close achievement gaps. Progress monitoring from 2021-2022 indicates a stagnant growth in our lowest 25 percent in ELA and in order to increase proficiency, differentiated small group instruction is necessary.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	If the school implements research based best practices (Learning Arc, SIPPS-tier 3, guided reading, Wonders Intervention- tier 2/Math: Reveal Math Intervention, and cPalms) and targeted small group instruction, ELA and Math proficiency along with learning gains will increase by 5 percentage points by progress monitoring data and state assessments (F.A.S.T).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Learning Arc will be the focus at weekly planning. Administration will conduct targeted walkthrough to monitor the fidelity of instruction. Leadership team will monitor plans (MTSS and small group) bi-weekly. Administration will monitor grades to ensure students not showing adequate progress are targeted immediately. Diagnostic assessments will be given three times per year. Teachers will use this data to make informed decisions on differentiated instruction. In addition, teacher will use data from the F.A.S.T progress monitoring and STAR to triangulate student data to determine areas of strength and identify areas of growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Data will be used to drive differentiated instruction. The strategy of using data to make informed decisions based student need has been proven to positively impact student achievement in all subject areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific	The rationale for implementing this strategy to assist in closing the achievement gaps amongst a diverse student population. The data indicates that students are not internalizing data at a tier 1 level. In order for students to master grade level standards, students must receive targeted intensive instruction to meet their academic needs.

**strategy.
Describe the
resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

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.

Professional development in Learning Arc was provided to all instructional staff (implementation of BEST standards).

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Instructional coaches provided guidance in administering diagnostic assessments

Person Responsible	Erin Guptill (erin.guptill@polk-fl.net)

Daily monitoring by administration

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

MTSS will be monitored and facilitated to ensure student need is met.

Person Responsible	Marieka Allen (marieka.allen@polk-fl.net)

Instructional coach will assist in implementing Reveal Math and interventions provided.

Person Responsible	Denise Marolda (denise.marolda@polk-fl.net)

In primary grades, targeted small group instruction utilizing diagnostic assessments.

Person Responsible	Meredith Irwin (meredith.irwin@polk-fl.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.**	Based on state assessments and progress monitoring, Students with Disabilities performed below 41%. This subgroup did not make adequate growth; therefore, they are targeted for intensive instruction.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	If the school implements research based best practices (REVEAL Math interventions, Wonders Interventions, SIPPS, and LLI) and targeted small group instruction, ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains will increase by 5 percentage points.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Learning Arc will be the focus at weekly planning. Administration will conduct targeted walkthrough to monitor the fidelity of instruction. Leadership team will monitor plans (MTSS and small group) bi-weekly. Administration will monitor grades to ensure students not showing adequate progress are targeted immediately. Diagnostic assessments will be given three times per year. Teachers will use this data to make informed decisions on differentiated instruction. In addition, teacher will use data from the F.A.S.T progress monitoring and STAR to triangulate student data to determine areas of strength and identify areas of growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The strategy being implemented is to use data analysis to identify instructional weaknesses and provide differentiated small group instruction to address student deficiencies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The rationale for selecting this strategy is to close the achievement gap among our ESE subgroup. The data indicates that students are not internalizing information at a tier 1 level. In order for students to master grade level standards, students must receive intensive instruction to meet their academic needs.

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.

Teacher and support staff will identify students who are in the targeted subgroup

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Small group plans will have focus on targeted small group

Person Responsible	Rashawn Williams (rashawn.williams@polk-fl.net)

ESE teacher will attend PLC weekly

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Teacher and support staff will identify students who are in the targeted subgroup

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.net)

Small group plans will have focus on targeted small group

Person Responsible	Rashawn Williams (rashawn.williams@polk-fl.net)

ESE teacher will attend PLC weekly

Person Responsible	Christopher Miller (christopher.miller@polk-fl.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

Based on progress monitoring data for ELA (STAR/STAR Early Lit), our students are below level as follows:
KG-33% (STAR Early Lit)
1st- 35%
2nd- 51%
KG-2nd will continue to implement targeted small group instruction. Teachers will begin Learning Arc to help create objectives and analyze state standards to better provide instruction to students within their respective grade levels. The provide enrichment/ acceleration for students, STEM will continue to be implemented schoolwide.

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

Based on statewide assessment for ELA, our students are below level as follows:
3rd- 62%
4th- 66%
5th- 51%
3rd-5th grade will continue to implement targeted small group instruction. Teachers will continue their professional learning from the previous year. The grade level band has made an 18 point gain from

2020-2021 to 2021-2022. However, ELA proficiency is still below 50%. The restructuring of coach assessments will assist in streamlining support to grade levels. In addition, teachers will analyze new state standards using the Arc format. This will help in planning instruction on grade level within the benchmark confinements. To provide enrichment/acceleration, our school will continue to implement STEM.

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)

If we implement targeted small group instruction and standards based instruction, student will make a 5 percentage point growth as determined by F.A.S.T. assessment and STAR assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

If we implement learning arc (analyzing standards), standards based instruction, and targeted small group instruction, students will make a 5 percentage point growth as determined by progress monitor period 3 on F.A.S.T.

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.

The areas of focus will be monitored by daily classroom walkthroughs, participation in professional learning communities, and the implementation of diagnostic assessments. We are implementing diagnostic assessments that will be administered three times per year along with STAR continued implementation of STAR assessments will assist in monitoring our goal. After each diagnostic assessment, we will analyze if instruction is impacting student achievement.

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

Miller , Christopher , christopher.miller@polk-fl.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?

The strategy being implemented is to use data analysis (formative and summative) to identify instructional weaknesses and strengths. In addition, we implemented Diagnostic assessments to monitor instruction and targeted small group instruction.

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?

The rationale for selecting this strategy is close the achievement gaps among a diverse population. The data indicates that students are not internalizing information at a tier one level. In order for students to master grade level standards, students must be expose to grade level text, equivalent exposure to grade level questioning, tasks, writing, and research.

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
Establish literacy leadership committee	Williams, Rashawn, rashawn.williams@polk-fl.net
Literacy coaching K	Allen, Marieka, marieka.allen@polk-fl.net
Literacy Coaching 1st and 2nd	Irwin, Meredith, meredith.irwin@polk-fl.net
Literacy Coaching 3rd-5th	Guptill, Erin, erin.guptill@polk-fl.net
Teachers will implement learning arc / diagnostic assessment (progress monitoring)	Miller , Christopher , christopher.miller@polk-fl.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.

At R. Bruce Wagner Elementary, we foster all student learners and their families. We hold meaningful Family Nights to help promote different aspects of our students learning. Parents and families can attend the events and learn new ways to help their child at home. R. Bruce Wagner Elementary will continue implementing STEM initiatives into our lessons for the 2021-2022 school year. All students will now be exposed to critical thinking, hands on learning, and collaboration with their classmates. Each student learner is taken into consideration when creating engaging lessons with utilizing technology to enhance instruction. RBW has been a model PBiS School since 2013! We celebrate our students behaviors through a point system (token economy) that is individual to each student. Throughout the school-year, students can participate in school-wide dances, Spring Fling, and other various activities. We value our students, families, and the community and always welcome volunteers.

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

Families are major stakeholders at R. Bruce Wagner Elementary. As a school we foster a positive relationship through communication via Class Dojo, family nights, and conferences. Families are encouraged to participate in celebrations that take place throughout the school year. We invite all families to participate in our School Advisory Committee and provide input on making R. Bruce Wagner Elementary successful. Our Parent Teacher Association assists with helps to address barriers with fundraisers and community events.