**Nassau County School District** 

# Wildlight Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
|                                |    |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|                                |    |
| School Information             | 7  |
|                                |    |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
|                                |    |
| Planning for Improvement       | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
|                                |    |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# Wildlight Elementary

550 CURIOSITY AVE, Yulee, FL 32097

[ no web address on file ]

# **Demographics**

# **Principal: Amber Nicholas Bovinette**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | No   |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 34%  |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History   | 2021-22: A (65%)<br>2018-19: A (69%)<br>2017-18: B (61%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*  |
| SI Region   | Northeast  |
| Regional Executive Director   | Cassandra Brusca   |
| 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 Nassau 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

# **Table of Contents**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|--------------------------------|----|
|                                |    |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
|                                | -  |
| Planning for Improvement       | 14 |
| Title I De suring as ante      |    |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# Wildlight Elementary

550 CURIOSITY AVE, Yulee, FL 32097

[ no web address on file ]

# **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID |          | 2021-22 Title I School | l Disadvan | <b>Property Section Property 2 Property 2 Property 3 Property 3 Property 3</b> |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5            | School   | No                     |            | 34%  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I   |          | Charter School         | (Reporte   | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)  |
| K-12 General E                  | ducation | No                     |            | 32%  |
| School Grades Histo             | ory      |                        |            |  |
| Year                            | 2021-22  | 2020-21                | 2019-20    | 2018-19  |
| Grade                           | Α        |                        | А          | Α  |

## **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau 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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

## 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 mission of Wildlight Elementary School is to embrace diversity and create a community of risk-taking, self-motivated learners who will reach their maximum potential academically, socially and developmentally in a safe and nurturing learning environment.

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

The vision of Wildlight Elementary is to allow all students to reach their maximum potential in all aspects of life by providing a safe learning environment, embracing diversity and creating a community of risk-taking, self-motivated learners.

# 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Nicholas-<br>Bovinette,<br>Amber | Principal              | Coordinates administrative oversight and plans for all phases of instructional leadership for the school including educational programming, administration, budgetary planning, discipline, and counseling services. |
| McBee,<br>Heather                | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Kindergarten representative  |
| Hart,<br>Samantha                | Teacher,<br>K-12       | 1st grade representative   |
| Fancher,<br>Melissa              | Teacher,<br>K-12       | 2nd grade representative   |
| Eliason,<br>Jerri                | Teacher,<br>K-12       | 3rd grade representative   |
| Druelle,<br>Ashley               | Teacher,<br>K-12       | 5th grade representative   |
| Ray,<br>Sarah                    | Assistant<br>Principal | Instructional Leader, SAC Chair Mentor   |
| Faucher,<br>Natalie              | Reading<br>Coach       | Reading Coach, Data and Tutoring Lead  |
| Hires,<br>Erika                  | Teacher,<br>ESE        | ESE representative   |

# **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/15/2020, Amber Nicholas Bovinette

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.

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,030

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

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

**Demographic Data** 

# **Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| indicator  | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 186         | 167 | 177 | 156 | 151 | 173 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 1010  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 21          | 18  | 25  | 16  | 16  | 21  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 117   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 1   | 0   | 2   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 6     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 3           | 4   | 1   | 5   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 15    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 4   | 1   | 5   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 22  | 15  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 38    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 21  | 15  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 36    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 18  | 0   | 1   | 17  | 8   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 44    |
|  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  |       |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |    |   | Gra | ade | Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|---|-----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5   | 6   | 7  | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 6 | 4 | 2 | 13 | 6 | 5   | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |

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

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3 | 2           | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |  |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |  |  |

## Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/11/2022

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator  | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 156         | 119 | 148 | 140 | 128 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 840   |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 24          | 15  | 9   | 18  | 14  | 15  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 95    |  |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 3   | 1   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |  |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 4   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |  |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 5   | 1   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 5   | 9   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 7   | 5   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 21          | 9   | 13  | 13  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |  |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |

## The number of students identified as retainees:

| la dia séa n                        |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | eve |   |    |    |    | Tatal |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| indicator  | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 156         | 119 | 148 | 140 | 128 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 840   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 24          | 15  | 9   | 18  | 14  | 15  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 95    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 3   | 1   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 4   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 4     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 5   | 1   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 5   | 9   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 16    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 7   | 5   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 14    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 21          | 9   | 13  | 13  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 56    |

# 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    | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5           | 4 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 22    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |       |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
|                                     |   | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 7 | 2           | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 13    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1     |

# Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

# **School Data Review**

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

| School Grade Component      |        | 2022     |       |        | 2021     |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 74%    | 69%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 74%    | 76%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 66%    |          |       |        |          |       | 63%    | 65%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 55%    |          |       |        |          |       | 54%    | 54%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 79%    | 53%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 82%    | 85%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 60%    |          |       |        |          |       | 75%    | 77%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 55%    |          |       |        |          |       | 56%    | 67%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 65%    | 81%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 76%    | 75%      | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 03         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 77%    | 75%      | 2%                                | 58%   | 19%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 72%    | 68%      | 4%                                | 58%   | 14%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -77%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |
| 05         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 67%    | 75%      | -8%                               | 56%   | 11%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -72%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|           |          |        | MATH     |                                   |          |                                |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State    | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 02        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 03        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 82%    | 83%      | -1%                               | 62%      | 20%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 04        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 80%    | 81%      | -1%                               | 64%      | 16%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -82%   |          |                                   | · '      |                                |
| 05        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 82%    | 86%      | -4%                               | 60%      | 22%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -80%   | '        |                                   | <u>'</u> |                                |

|            |          |        | SCIEN    | CE                                |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 76%    | 73%      | 3%                                | 53%   | 23%                            |
| Cohort Com | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

# Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2022      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD       | 53          | 58        | 54                | 60           | 40         | 48                 | 57          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 63          | 67        |                   | 58           | 55         |                    | 56          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 73          | 65        |                   | 79           | 65         |                    | 73          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 76          | 69        |                   | 77           | 71         |                    | 38          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 76          | 66        | 56                | 82           | 59         | 57                 | 70          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 66          | 63        | 55                | 70           | 54         | 48                 | 48          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 68          | 57        |                   | 76           | 71         | 77                 | 57          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 75          |           |                   | 86           |            |                    | 73          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 91          |           |                   | 100          |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 72          |           |                   | 71           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 81          | 79        | 71                | 92           | 82         | 71                 | 81          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 73          | 55        | 50                | 83           | 76         | 56                 | 65          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 67          | 62        | 62                | 65           | 66         | 61                 | 62          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 68          | 68        |                   | 68           | 59         |                    | 73          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 53          |           |                   | 65           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 50          | 40        |                   | 75           | 80         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 78          | 67        | 64                | 86           | 78         | 61                 | 80          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 65          | 57        | 45                | 73           | 75         | 53                 | 61          |            |              |                         |                           |

# **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  | 65  |
| 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 |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 454 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |

| Students With Disabilities   |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities   | 53                 |
| 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  |                    |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | N/A                |
| 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  |                    |
| Black/African American Students Federal Index - Black/African American Students  | 60                 |
|  | 60<br>NO           |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  |                    |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   | NO                 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%   | NO                 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  Hispanic Students  | NO<br>0            |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  Hispanic Students  Federal Index - Hispanic Students   | NO 0 71            |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  Hispanic Students  Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | NO 0 71 NO         |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  Hispanic Students  Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  | NO 0 71 NO         |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  Hispanic Students  Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  | NO 0 71 NO 0       |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  Hispanic Students  Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  | NO 0 71 NO 0 66    |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  Hispanic Students  Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | NO 0 71 NO 0 66 NO |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  Hispanic Students  Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                       | NO 0 71 NO 0 66 NO |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  Hispanic Students  Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  Pacific Islander Students | NO 0 71 NO 0 66 NO |

| White Students  |    |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - White Students  | 67 |
| 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                         | 58 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

0

Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%

# **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?

Across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas, WES is consistently at or above the State average (except one area is slightly lower). Data took a dip from the previous year's data, but still trending upward from data from years prior.

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

The greatest need for improvement is Math achievement and gains in ELA and Math for the lowest 25%.

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

Contributing factors include being in a high growth area with a heavy student transiency rate. Another factor is newer teachers and/or those new to the county who are learning the standards, test specs, and common best practices. New actions will be to observe how Daily Math is taught and identify specific best practices for ways that this will look at WES (i.e. student work expectations, how to review, etc.) New actions also to include work with new standards and new Math text to ensure beginning with the end in mind, and progress monitoring consistently with new progress monitoring tools provided by the state. New action will also include Math tutoring.

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

ELA showed the greatest area of achievement, exceeding District and State averages.

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

School Action Plans have been heavily rooted in ELA. Most observations, feedback, discussions, professional development, tutoring revolved around ELA, leading to greater achievement in this area than in Math/Science.

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

Strategies will include focus on the new standards and new curriculum in ELA and Math to ensure understanding of the standards and the tools for teaching them. Focus will also be on data analysis with new progress monitoring tools. The data will then drive the planning and instruction. We will continue to implement professional development in these areas, along with tutoring, targeted classroom learning walks, Mentoring Marigolds program for new teachers, oversight and feedback of the Saxon Phonics program, and continued professional development and observations for our paraprofessionals by the Reading Coach.

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.

Targeted classroom learning walks, revisiting learning goals and targets, utilizing the state's suggested tool for targeting standards with explicit, scaffolded, differentiated instruction, ensuring common language across the curriculums/subjects/instruction, continued support for the Leadership team as they lead their grade level teams, establishment of Literacy and Math teams to continue to build capacity for Leadership within the school, participation with District professional development, continued support with Saxon phonics, continued support with new standards, curriculum, and data analysis with new progress monitoring tools.

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

Recruiting and retaining high quality teachers is a high priority. Common planning will continue to be implemented to ensure sustainability, as well as established common academic language, as we continue to refine. Tightening planning routines will also assist with sustainability of improvement as we move from year to year, in addition to maintaining our District/School relationships with NEFEC and the DOE.

#### **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 Math**

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

data reviewed.

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

Overall Math Achievement is identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Math achievement percentage points dropped 12% from 2021 to 2022, and Math Learning gains were below the state average. Math gains for the lowest 25% were equal to the state average, but below the District average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

WES will achieve at least 80% (or higher) in Math achievement for the 22-23 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Area of Focus will be monitored with targeted classroom walk-thrus and monitoring of implementation of professional development by Administration and Leadership Team.

Person responsible for monitoring

outcome:

Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based

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

Consistent implementation of Daily Math with best practices will be used commonly across all grade levels, along with implementation of Math tutoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Daily Math is aligned to the standards and strategically spirals all of the standards throughout the school year. Although it is used across campus, use of this tool varies widely from class to class. The goal is to make implementation consistent, with a focus toward use of best practices in delivery and expectation of student work. Team will also set a schedule, expectations and strategies/protocol for Math tutoring.

#### **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.

Assemble a Math Committee (comprised of Math Planning Leads) on each grade level to provide a "train the trainer model" of professional development and review daily Math and develop school-wide, explicit expectations for implementation.

**Person Responsible** Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Explicit standards walk-thrus will take place with Administration and Grade Level Chairs/Math Planning Team Leads to observe implementation of Daily Math and Math tutoring, look for common practices, best practices, and areas for continued tweaking and improvement.

**Person Responsible** Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Reflect with grade level team on practices for growth. Observe for implementation during Administrative walk-thrus, providing teacher modeling where needed, and continuing the cycle of professional development based on observed needs and data.

**Person Responsible** Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@nassau.k12.fl.us)

## #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Leader in Me

# Area of Focus Description

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

Leader in Me is a book study WES began six years ago. We continue to glean from this book and implement strategies to help raise the next generation of leaders. We believe all students can be leaders. An example area is use of school-wide data notebooks because a need was recognized for students to take ownership of their own data.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of students at WES will have data notebooks, and will be able to articulate the data to their teacher and/or family.

## Monitoring:

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

Data Notebooks will be monitored by the classroom teacher and Administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidencebased strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus

Students owning their own data is a high effect strategy. Self-reported grades/student expectations has the highest effect size of 1.44.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This strategy was selected by our teachers after understanding the tenants of the book, Leader in Me. Teachers know the students' data, but students don't often understand their data. Understanding their data gives them the power to set and achieve goals, arming them with strategies to become thinkers and leaders.

#### **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.

Administration will lead a conversation with the Leadership Team regarding re-establishment of data notebooks and re-visioning the data notebooks based on relevant and updated data available.

# Person Responsible Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Each Grade Level Chair will work with their teams to assemble a mock data notebook, and bring it to the Leadership Team meeting to share out how their team built the notebook and rationale. Grade Chairs will collaborate with each other across grade levels to ensure that the data being collected is the most useful data and share ideas that could be adapted in other grade levels.

## **Person Responsible** Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Grade Level teams will implement data notebooks and/or data notebook revisions with their classes, and teach their students how to interpret, record their data, and how to set SMART goals. Students will be able to articulate their data and goals to their teacher and families. Students will work toward these long and short term goals, as they work toward standards mastery and "own" their data.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

# **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.

Collaboration and an environment of trust with high expectations is established over time with through relationships and shared values & vision. Positive school culture also comes through PBIS, with the implementation of Skills Streaming, 7 Habits of Happy Kids, and school-wide implementation of Leader in Me. Faculty and Staff are celebrated for implementation of best practices and class achievement, as well as being honored throughout the year with various culture building luncheons and activities. Community involvement is also paramount and contributes to overall success and culture at WES.

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

Administration sets the tone and expectation and the structure for collaboration and trust to occur. It begins with Leadership. The faculty and staff have a role in recognizing and upholding each other, collaborating with each other for the betterment of our students and school, and offering ideas and suggestions for continuing to enhance positive school culture. The Community, including PTO offers services for all to partake in, such as special luncheons and recognitions. Our SAC Committee provides oversight of the implementation of our School Improvement Plan and always asks and follows through with ways to promote positive school culture and environment. WES celebrates with all of its stakeholders, as we move forward with raising our next generation of young citizens.