Polk County Public Schools

Winston Academy Of Engineering



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Winston Academy Of Engineering

3415 SWINDELL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

Demographics

Principal: Lucus Wilkins

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2022

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)	80%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	rmation*
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo	or more information, <u>click here</u> .

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	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Winston Academy Of Engineering

3415 SWINDELL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

School Demographics

School Type and Gr (per MSID I		2021-22 Title I Schoo	I Disadvan	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S PK-5	School	Yes		80%
Primary Servio (per MSID I		Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		61%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	С		А	Α

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.

Our mission is to collaborate and use creative thinking to solve real-world problems, build and achieve dreams, embrace diverse cultures, and cultivate competitive engineers by preparing them for a diverse global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Winston Academy of Engineering will ensure the highest standards of intellectual development through a stimulating and comprehensive STEM program with an emphasis on Engineering. The learning community is actively involved to instill within students the courage to take appropriate risks, and have the confidence to accept challenges. Together we will give rise to students who are resilient and adaptable, equipped with knowledge and a 21st century skill set to achieve their greatest potential in an ever changing, diverse society.

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
Wilkins, Lucus	Principal	Oversees the basic operations of the school including but not limited to, finances, faculty, instruction, personnel, and safety.
McKenna, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in overseeing the basic operations of the school including but not limited to, discipline, curriculum, testing, safety, facilities, and maintenance.
Stedem- Wyma, Stacy	Instructional Coach	Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates databased decision making activities to assist teachers in developing lesson plans that implements the curriculum that meets the needs of students; provides professional development and individual coaching as needed and maintains all Title I documentation.
Accardo, Michelle	School Counselor	Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design assessment and intervention with individual students. Assists teachers in implementing and maintaining MTSS procedures communicates with parents whose students are in the MTSS process, and counsels students experiencing emotional distress.
Caron, Marjorie	Teacher, K-12	Teaching gifted students in grades K-5 and serving as an instructional coach for teachers.
Lockhart, Gina	Teacher, ESE	Provides instructional support for KG-5th grade ESE students; maintains data regarding instructional accommodations and implementation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2022, Lucus Wilkins

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.

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.

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

509

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													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	61	76	82	82	84	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	464
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	9	10	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	3	1	2	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	15	29	13	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
Students with two or more indicators	1	9	3	5	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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

lu di sata s						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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

Thursday 9/1/2022

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

Indicator					Gr	ade	Le	eve	el					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
Number of students enrolled	0	83	88	87	77	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	15	7	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	3	0	2	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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 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	12	23	23	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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

Indicator						Gra	de l	Lev	el					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	11	8	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total									
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2									
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
illuicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
Number of students enrolled	0	83	88	87	77	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	15	7	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	3	0	2	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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 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	12	23	23	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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

Indicator	Grade Level											Total		
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	11	8	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

Sahaal Crada Company		2022			2021		2019		
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	64%	47%	56%				74%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						68%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						56%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	68%	42%	50%				74%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	51%						64%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						40%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	49%	59%				59%	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 Con	nparison					
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Con	Cohort Comparison					
03	2022					
	2019	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				
04	2022					
	2019	77%	48%	29%	58%	19%
Cohort Con	nparison	-71%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	47%	26%	56%	17%
Cohort Con	nparison	-77%				

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Cor	nparison					
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Cor	Cohort Comparison					
03	2022					
	2019	83%	56%	27%	62%	21%
Cohort Cor	nparison	0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
Cohort Cor	nparison	-83%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	51%	17%	60%	8%
Cohort Cor	nparison	-71%				

			SCIEN	CE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	59%	45%	14%	53%	6%
Cohort Com	parison					

Subgroup Data Review

		2022	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	19	55	40	42	45	50					
ELL	50	54		58	50		33				
ASN	91			100							
BLK	38	44	35	55	46	45	39				
HSP	56	56	38	58	51	42	42				
WHT	85	62		82	50		79				
FRL	47	51	36	57	47	46	40				
		2021	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17			21							
ELL	58	43		62	21		46				
ASN	91			91							
BLK	45	36	10	41	21	15	46				
HSP	57	45		59	25		53				
WHT	80	20		84	32		84				
FRL	52	28	20	48	20	9	32				
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	47	55	35	67	58					
ELL	62	71		58	46	27	33				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	52	57	50	53	48	41	27				
HSP	75	71	60	73	59	33	67				
WHT	90	71		91	80		78				
FRL	59	63	52	64	61	45	42				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	96
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	50
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	
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	72
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	48
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?

The number of students proficient in ELA and Math were above 60% and in Science, student proficiency was above 50%. Our ELL population dropped in ELA achievement but gained in Math.

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

Learning Gains in ELA and Math do not correlate to our proficiency in ELA and Math.

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

There is a need for higher level text complexity and instruction in ELA and fluency in Math. Planning must occur using the ARC method to teach to the intent of the standard.

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

Increases in Learning Gains in both ELA and Math especially in our SWD population and bottom 25%.

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

School-wide concerted effort to work with small iii groups by support staff in both ELA and Math.

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

Introducing higher level, complex text in all grade level ELA instruction and focus on math fluency.

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.

We will train staff on BEST benchmarks in both ELA and Math and provide support and strategies for student success. Using the ARC strategy as directed by the district to become the way of work for planning sessions in ELA and math. Aligning student task to the intent of the standard.

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

We will focus on Data chats, iii support, grade level collaborative planning, and providing new teacher support and coaching.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Due to the new BEST Standards, there is a need to focus instruction to align to the full intent of the standard that allows for target / task alignment to ensure student success and mastery.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Currently ELA proficiency is at 64% a planned increase of 6% is obtainable focusing on teacher planning and target task instructional reviews. In math current proficiency is at 68% with a planned increase of 5% is obtainable through planning and task/ target instructional reviews.

Monitoring will take place using FAST 3-5 and STAR K-2 as scheduled

Monthly classroom Instructional Reviews focusing on the ARC process

by the district. On going monitoring will take place through weekly/

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lucus Wilkins (lucus.wilkins@polk-fl.net)

of target/task alignment.

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Collaborative planning with ELA and Math classroom teachers and coaches will be utilized to streamline and focus instructional practices for whole group and interventions that are aligned to standards for proficiency in both ELA and Math using the ARC process designed by the district.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students will be exposed to grade level, standards based activities, higher level thinking questions, and academic vocabulary in order to show proficiency in both ELA and Math that is aligned to the whole intent of the Best standard.

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.

The Leadership Team will conduct calibration walkthrough observations of collaborative planning and classroom instruction with an area of focus on standards-based instruction and target / task alignment using the ARC process during PLC's

Person Responsible

Lucus Wilkins (lucus.wilkins@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.

Winston will partner with families to ensure the highest standards of intellectual development through a comprehensive STEM program. Parents will receive effective and consistent communication regarding curriculum and the progress of students. They will also receive resources they can use in home to assist. We will utilize our social media platforms to provide inclusivity with our stakeholders. Our school will utilize our Community Liason to build relationships with our business partners and families. Finally, we will invite parents back on campus for family nights and events through out the school year to build and maintain a positive school culture.

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

Pre-school Programs: The VPK is coordinated by the District Office and housed at Winston Academy to prepare future kindergarten students with academic and social skills.

Title III/ESOL: Supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their families are coordinated through the District.

SAC: Parents are notified of the SAC Meetings at the beginning of the year via the school calendar that is distributed to all students and posted on Class DOJO. In addition parents are reminded of the SAC meetings via the school Facebook page, marquee, and Class DOJO.

PTA: PTA invites parents to join at the Kindergarten Kick-Off and Back to School Orientation each year. PTA also distributes information regarding upcoming events with volunteer opportunities via their Facebook page and email. PTA also helps to solicit business partners via the same means.

Community Agencies and Business Partners: Community agencies and business partners are solicited through various PTA and staff members making phone calls to request supplies and donations for various projects and events. In addition, each November, the school hosts the Great American Teach in to develop relationships with community members and grow interest in partnering with our school.