

Polk County Public Schools

Wahneta Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Wahneta Elementary School

205 4TH ST E, Winter Haven, FL 33880

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/wahnetael>

Demographics

Principal: Dagmaríel Pérez Mald

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2016

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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Wahnetta Elementary School

205 4TH ST E, Winter Haven, FL 33880

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/wahnetael>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">90%</p>

School Grades History

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

The purpose of Wahneta Elementary is to ensure that all students become productive citizens who are life-long learners with choices in life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wahneta Elementary students will attend school daily, come to school prepared, and follow school-wide rules and policies. The curriculum and instruction will meet the needs of every individual student, including students with disabilities and limited English proficient students, by providing additional academic assistance through small grouping, tutoring, extended day activities, and differentiated instruction in a challenging and nurturing environment.

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
Caraballo, Nildalis	Principal	
Taveras, Marlene	Assistant Principal	
Rodriguez, Janira	Reading Coach	
Agostnelli, Bethany	Math Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/20/2016, Dagmariel Perez Mald

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

489

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

4

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

6

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	70	83	86	78	60	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	457
Attendance below 90 percent	28	36	26	19	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	26	36	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	27	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	32	36	46	38	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189

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	8	15	15	19	39	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

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	5	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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

Monday 8/22/2022

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	43	77	72	90	83	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	33	23	11	21	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	15	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	41	49	43	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180

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	9	16	16	26	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	43	77	72	90	83	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	33	23	11	21	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	15	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	41	49	43	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180

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	9	16	16	26	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	33%	47%	56%				38%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						55%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						47%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	46%	42%	50%				61%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	54%						60%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						31%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	24%	49%	59%				46%	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	29%	52%	-23%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	38%	48%	-10%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

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	58%	56%	2%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	56%	13%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	45%	-4%	53%	-12%
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	8	25	19	23	48	53	11				
ELL	26	46	29	43	52	55	20				
HSP	33	52	35	47	55	53	25				
WHT	37	56		42	44		27				
FRL	29	50	35	44	53	54	26				

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	10	33		17	38						
ELL	22	34	38	36	33	33	22				
HSP	28	36	44	40	34	40	25				
WHT	33	30		31	45		20				
FRL	25	37	39	38	32	35	24				
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	15	20		48	56						
ELL	31	52	39	58	60	32	34				
HSP	38	55	38	62	61	31	46				
WHT	37	40		63	50						
FRL	36	57	54	59	60	33	41				

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
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	41
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	42
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?

In grades 3-5 proficiency levels are 33 % in reading; this includes economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities according to FSA Data.

In grades 3-5 proficiency levels are 46 % in math; this includes economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities according to STAR Data.

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

When comparing the 2022 progress monitoring data (STAR) and 2021 state assessment (FSA) in reading, there is was an increase of 9% in proficiency in reading.

When comparing the 2022 progress monitoring data (STAR) and 2021 state assessment (FSA) in math, there is an increase of 7% in proficiency in math.

When comparing the 2022 progress monitoring data (Science Quarterly Assessment) and 2022 science state assessment (SSA), the proficiency was 24% and did not change from previous year.

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

Wahnetta students struggle with reading in general because we have a significant amount of ELL students. ELL students are more likely than native speakers to lack the background knowledge necessary for understanding text. Additionally, teachers lack the knowledge of differentiating instruction based on students needs and selecting resources that support learning. Most impactful for the decrease across contents area was the student and staff attendance this past year.

Small Group for reading intervention will focus on building foundational skills, using balanced literacy instruction with a focus on word study and vocabulary, group, and individual story reading, writing activities and progress monitoring.

Small groups for math will focus on math fluency, teach foundational skills, build background for upcoming lessons using manipulatives in a more controlled environment and progress monitoring.

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

All core content areas showed a increase across the board, however, science showed stood the same.

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

Data from ongoing assessments was used to reteach concepts, writing was embedded throughout the lessons, and hands on experiences were provided.

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

Use the Learning Arc to uncover the state intent of the benchmark and develop objectives.

Small group instruction with Corrective Reading Program, tutoring, and morning labs with targeted lessons based on data.

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.

Reading, math coaches and administration will support teachers in implementing effective strategies to improve student learning by implementing the Learning Arc to uncover the state intent of the benchmark and develop objectives for instructional purposes. Teachers will be tiered according to needs and progress monitoring data will be used to provide targeted support.

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

Additionally, staff will engage in professional development centered around motivating students to learn.

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.

Based on 2021-22 FSA ELA data 67% of 3-5 grade students scored a level 1 and 2. ESSA students with disabilities was at a 31%.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

As a result of implementing effective small group instruction in ELA 35% of students will earn a level 3,4 or 5 on the FAST assessment. ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities, will increase to 32%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

- 1.FAST data will be used to measure growth in reading
2. Weekly MTTs Data
3. Quarterly Data Review with Administration

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlene Taveras (marlen.taveras@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The following programs will be implemented in small group to support the following grade levels K-2 Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) and 3-5 Corrective Reading. LLI Small group for reading intervention would focus on building foundational skills, using balanced literacy instruction with a focus on word study and vocabulary, small group and individual story reading, writing activities and progress monitoring. Corrective Reading in focused on fluency and decoding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Wahneta students struggle with reading in general because we have a significant amount of ELL students. ELLs are more likely than native speakers to lack the background knowledge necessary for understanding texts. ELLs' prior educational experiences may have been substandard or interrupted, so reading texts that assume certain prior knowledge becomes difficult. Teachers lack the knowledge of differentiating instruction based on students needs and selecting resources to support learning.

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.

1. Teachers meet with administration to review STAR, FAST and FSA data to create small groups.
2. Conduct classroom walk-throughs using the walk-through tool with all grade levels to monitor implementation of research-based remediation resource.
3. Monitor/review teacher/para expectations during small group instruction/centers and adequate use of resource (students using digital resources (iStation and Smarty Ants), and small group intervention materials (LLI and Corrective Reading)
4. Progress monitor using District Ongoing Assessments(Admin., Reading Coaches, Teachers, Five Title 1 Paras, ESE Para and Migrant Para will all be participating in data chats)
5. Supplies (classroom supplies -paper, ink, agendas) will be used to document data results.

Person

Responsible

Nildalis Caraballo (nildalis.caraballo@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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 2021-22 FSA ELA data 33% of 3-5 grade students scored a level 3 or higher. ESSA students with disabilities was at a 31%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

State data will show a minimum of +1% proficiency increase for all grades.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. STAR ongoing assessment.
2. Weekly walkthroughs using School Walkthrough Tool (SWT).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nildalis Caraballo (nildalis.caraballo@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Transition teachers into using the Arc Framework during Standards-based planning.
2. Monitor students' engagement in equivalent experiences related to the BEST standards using the SWT.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

There are a number of benefits to writing a lesson plan, lesson planning produces more unified lessons (Jensen, 2001). It gives teachers the opportunity to think deliberately about their choice of lesson objectives, the types of activities that will meet these objectives, the sequence of those activities, the materials needed, how long each activity might take, and how students should be grouped.

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.

1. Transition to using the Arc framework for planning by December 2022.
2. Weekly PLC's and collaborative planning.
3. Monitor lesson plans and ensure objectives are aligned to tasks

Person Responsible

Nildalis Caraballo (nildalis.caraballo@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

STAR Early Lit. Data:

K- 61%

1st Grade -53%

2nd Grade - 51%

Area of Focus will be small group instruction using Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI).

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

The criteria which qualified our school for RAISE in grades 3-5 was 50 percent or more of our students scored below a level 3 on the most recent ELA FSA.

3rd grade - 28%, 4th grade - 38%, 5th grade - 31%.

Area of Focus will be small group instruction using Corrective Reading Program.

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)

Progress Monitoring K-1 - Star Early Lit and 2nd grade- STAR Reading. We want to increase ELA proficiency by +1% in each grade level.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Progress Monitoring 3rd-5th Grade - F.A.S.T. We want to increase ELA proficiency by +1% in each grade level.

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.

Classroom walk-throughs, monthly fluency checks and the FAST assessment will be used to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Taveras, Marlene, marlen.taveras@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. Â§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?

Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is used for explicit instruction to addresses Comprehension, Phonemic Awareness, Fluency, Vocab & Phonics. This is a literacy Intervention Program for Students who lack basic Reading & Writing Skills.

Corrective Reading is designed to promote reading accuracy (decoding) and fluency, skills of students in grade 3 or higher who are reading below their grade level. The program has four levels that correspond to students' decoding skills. All lessons in the program are sequenced and scripted. This program is researched based- recommended by the District.

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 literacy programs that will be implemented will support teachers with the delivery of tightly sequenced, carefully planned lessons that give struggling students the structure and practice necessary to become skilled, fluent readers.

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
1. Teachers will receive training to implement LLI for K-2 and Corrective Reading for 3-5 2. Groups of students will be identified based on STAR, FSA scores, teacher and FAST assessments 3. Progress monitoring using the program assessments	Caraballo, Nildalis, nildalis.caraballo@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.

Wahnetta Elementary uses PBIS school-wide, a proactive approach to improve school safety and promote positive behavior. The focus of PBIS is prevention, not punishment. We teach students positive behavior strategies by rewarding them when good choices are made. All students learn about behavior, including those with IEPs and 504 plans. PBIS recognizes that students can only meet behavioral expectations if they know what the expectations are. Everyone learns what's considered to be appropriate behavior and uses a common language to talk about it. Throughout the school day—in class, at lunch, and on the bus—students understand what's expected of them.

We also take pride in building a positive culture for our wonderful staff. Staff is also rewarded for exceeding expectations. We have a monthly superstar posted in the lunchroom, usually the staff nominated is one who has gone above and beyond the call of duty. We provide treats and passes for JEANS on a monthly basis for perfect attendance and we also have bi-monthly socials to enjoy each other's company outside of the classroom.

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

At Wahneta Elementary we take pride in building relationships with our staff, students, parents and the community. We understand that our school is embedded in the community. When we reach out to the community, especially parents - to involve them in the day-to-day life of the school, we know our parents are more likely to support our teachers and students and help them succeed. Many of our parents and community members are active in our SAC committee or are volunteers and they take pride in supporting the school with decisions that impact learning, the budgets and social activities. In the last four years, we have continued to reach out and engage families and community leaders which has strengthened the school's ability to network within the community to find new supports and resources to partner to meet the needs of students. Wahneta Elementary has a partnerships with POLYGLASS a commercial roofing company in the neighborhood who provided the school with a generous grant to purchase books and will be sponsoring a field trip with our 5th graders this year. We also partner with several retirement communities in the area who volunteer at Wahneta and provide our students with school supplies.