

Orange County Public Schools

Wedgefield School



2021-22 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	22
Positive Culture & Environment	28
Budget to Support Goals	29

Wedgefield School

3835 BANCROFT BLVD, Orlando, FL 32833

<https://wedgefieldk8.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Pritts

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2020-21 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/8/2022.

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	22
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	29

Wedgefield School

3835 BANCROFT BLVD, Orlando, FL 32833

<https://wedgefieldk8.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>41%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>47%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
Grade		A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/8/2022.

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Longhouse, Randall	Principal	School-Based Budget, Supervision of Progress Monitoring, Teacher and Staff Observations and Evaluations, Oversees School-Wide Data Reporting and Monitoring, Oversees MTSS Data and Tracking, Oversees DPLC PD and Professional Learning Communities, Parent Engagement/Involvement, Student/Staff Morale, Teacher Retention, Community Liaison
Booth, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Teacher and Staff Observations and Evaluations, Oversees Digital and Property Inventory, Facilities, Safety and Emergency Management Coordinator, Leads Professional Learning Communities, Oversees ESE Department, School-Wide Data Tracking and Monitoring, Parent/Staff Engagement, Supports DPLC Initiatives, Master Schedule/FTE
Becker, Sarah	Instructional Coach	Reading/Science Coach 4-8, Professional Learning Committee Meeting Facilitator, DPLC PD, MTSS Tier 2 and 3 Data Tracking and Support, School-Wide Data/Progress Monitoring, Classroom Coaching Observations, New Teacher Mentor Program
Vanmali, Ranji	Instructional Coach	Math Coach 4-8, Professional Learning Committee Meeting Facilitator, DPLC PD, School-Wide Data/Progress Monitoring, Classroom Coaching Observations, afterschool tutoring coordinator
Hales, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach K-3, Professional Learning Committee Meeting Facilitator, DPLC PD, Testing Coordinator, Data Tracking and Support, School-Wide Data/Progress Monitoring, Classroom Coaching Observations,
Blackwell, Robin	Other	Staffing Specialist- ESE/504 Coordinator, Compliance, MTSS Tracking, 504s, IEP's, Parent Meetings, ESE/ESOL Testing Liaison, ESOL Compliance, Behavior Support and Tracking
Gefter, Audra	School Counselor	Supports Students' Academic, Emotional, and Life Needs, SAFE Coordinator, Character Lab Monitor, Promotes/Coordinates College and Career Readiness, Threat Assessment/Mental Health Designee, Facilitates Social Skills Small Groups, Kognito Representative
Besaw, Sue Ann	School Counselor	Supports Students' Academic, Emotional, and Life Needs, Child Safety Matters Instructor, Character Lab Monitor, Threat Assessment/Mental Health Designee, Facilitates Social Skills Small Groups, Kognito Representative
Lewis, Shelton	Dean	Behavior Support, Behavior Data and Tracking, Behavior PD, Classroom Management Mentor, Behavior MTSS, Student Morale/Engagement, Parent Meetings, Community Liaison

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shanafelt, Lesley	Instructional Media	Media Specialist- Digital Lead, Textbook Inventory, Textbook Manager, Battle of the Books, DCTL Committee Lead, Journalism, TV Production, Teach-In Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Matthew Pritts

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

875

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by 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	76	94	94	90	115	103	100	84	102	0	0	0	0	858
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	13	12	21	12	10	8	19	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	9	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	10	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	11	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	12	15	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	9	10	9	9	13	0	0	0	0	52

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	2	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/27/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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	42	101	93	114	112	102	109	112	104	0	0	0	0	889
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	17	16	18	12	12	4	2	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	6	8	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	13	1	1	8	27	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	14	1	12	4	5	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	17	15	14	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	15	22	26	14	0	0	0	0	79

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	8	12	8	17	16	19	0	0	0	0	80

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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	42	101	93	114	112	102	109	112	104	0	0	0	0	889
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	17	16	18	12	12	4	2	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	6	8	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	13	1	1	8	27	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	14	1	12	4	5	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	17	15	14	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	15	22	26	14	0	0	0	0	79

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	8	12	8	17	16	19	0	0	0	0	80

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	2	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	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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				64%	62%	61%	65%	60%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	60%	59%	56%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	55%	54%	48%	54%	52%
Math Achievement				64%	61%	62%	64%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains				61%	60%	59%	58%	60%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	54%	52%	50%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				62%	56%	56%	51%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				79%	74%	78%	75%	74%	77%

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
03	2021					
	2019	75%	55%	20%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	57%	7%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
06	2021					
	2019	60%	52%	8%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
07	2021					
	2019	59%	48%	11%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	63%	0%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
06	2021					
	2019	36%	43%	-7%	55%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
07	2021					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
08	2021					
	2019	59%	36%	23%	46%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	57%	49%	8%	48%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	80%	66%	14%	71%	9%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	63%	37%	61%	39%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady diagnostic assessments and district Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMAs) were used to compile the progress monitoring data below.

Grade 1					
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
English Language Arts	All Students	95	95	96	
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	0	20	
	Students With Disabilities	43	43	57	
	English Language Learners	26	33	50	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
Mathematics	All Students	95	95	96	
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	28	48	
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	20	
	English Language Learners	14	29	57	

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82	86	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	14
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	20
	English Language Learners	21	31	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82	86	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	4	15
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	106	108	110
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	5	5
	Students With Disabilities	0	29	31
	English Language Learners	21	41	47
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	106	108	110
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	6	35
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	5
	English Language Learners	0	7	21

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	100	101	100
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	8	17
	Students With Disabilities	0	10	0
	English Language Learners	32	43	48
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	100	101	100
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	15	35
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	10	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	89	91	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	7	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	19	33	34
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	89	91	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	13	29
	Students With Disabilities	7	7	14
	English Language Learners	0	0	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	89	91	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	61	64
	Students With Disabilities	27	20	33
	English Language Learners	29	14	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	97	100	101
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	0	11
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	27	36	39
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	97	100	101
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	9	18
	Students With Disabilities	0	6	6
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	85	83	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	11	11
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	19	29	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	85	83	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	2	6
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	73	74	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	63	73
	Students With Disabilities	40	33	50
	English Language Learners	25	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	85	86	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	8
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	33
	English Language Learners	19	28	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	85	86	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	7
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	85	86	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	33	49
	Students With Disabilities	33	8	17
	English Language Learners	17	33	33

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12	41	40	17	43	44	21	40			
ELL	18	30	31	23	30	14					
BLK	60	48		57	45		67				
HSP	49	49	46	47	48	42	47	77	83		
MUL	63	70		56	70						
WHT	62	52	44	64	52	53	64	79	86		
FRL	46	45	44	48	49	48	49	63	88		
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	11	35	35	27	43	42	10	23			
ELL	35	44	53	36	52	38	40				
ASN	77	73		69	91						

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
BLK	68	45	50	63	64	36	71	69	92		
HSP	52	48	43	56	56	42	49	59	81		
MUL	50	57		69	50						
WHT	68	54	43	67	62	52	65	85	90		
FRL	52	48	46	54	56	41	52	71	88		
2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	39	43	29	55	50	23	43	36		
ELL	32	53	60	29	53	60					
ASN	64	64		64	64						
BLK	65	50	67	66	54	53	50	91	88		
HSP	59	57	50	53	58	51	42	71	59		
MUL	47	50		60	50						
WHT	68	57	44	68	60	49	57	75	76		
FRL	54	51	43	56	57	51	40	67	74		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
---	----

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Analysis

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?

Historical and current data indicates that learning gains for students in the bottom quartile in both ELA and math is one of Wedgefield's lowest performing data components. Based on 2018-2019 FSA data, 42% of students in the bottom quartile demonstrated a learning gain in ELA and 48% of students in the bottom quartile demonstrated a learning gain in math. Students with Disabilities (SWD) is Wedgefield's another one of Wedgefield's lowest data component for students reaching proficiency and demonstrating a learning gain. Based on current data, 18% of SWD were projected to reach proficiency in ELA and 49% were projected to make a learning gain. Current data also indicates that 15% of SWD were projected to reach proficiency in math and 41% were predicted to make a learning gain. Seventh grade Civics data trends higher than all other data components, with 79% of students demonstrating mastery on the 2018-2019 End of Course exam.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on progress monitoring and 2019 FSA data, math learning gains for students in the bottom quartile is the data component that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. 2019 FSA data indicates that 48% of students in the bottom quartile demonstrated a learning gain and current progress monitoring data predicts 44% of students in the bottom quartile to demonstrate a learning gain in 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?

Contributing factors to areas that have a need for improvement include: inconsistent transfer of best practices for differentiation and small group instruction, lack of targeted math intervention outside of the math block, and inconsistent student progress monitoring.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based off progress monitoring and the previous state assessments in 2019, Wedgefield's Science SSA data and PMA data showed the most improvement. Science progress monitoring data and state assessment data showed a gradual increase of students reaching proficiency from 2018 to 2020. In 2018, 51% of students assessed reached proficiency on the science state assessment and in 2019, 62% of students assessed reached proficiency on the science state assessment, resulting in an 11% increase. Current progress monitoring data projects that 66% of students assessed will reach proficiency on the science state assessment.

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

New actions that contributed to this improvement were: creating higher expectations for explicit science instruction in primary grades, providing scaffolded supports, cross curricular activities, and implementation of flexible grouping in the classroom. These actions helped students process new content, examine their reasoning and increase their science academic vocabulary knowledge.

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

In order to accelerate learning, teachers need to create opportunities to preload content, create continuous progress monitoring, and use data to drive and differentiate instruction.

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.

Wedgefield's professional development plan for the 2021-2022 school year will include weekly PLC meetings focusing on building systems to analyze data, implement instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments to improve student outcomes. Teachers will be utilizing an item analysis to determine gaps and deficits based upon standard and have data driven discussions within PLCs. Administration will analyze instructional practices by providing coaching cycles for identified teachers with consistent monitoring and feedback. Differentiated professional opportunities will be offered throughout the year based on teacher need. These opportunities include professional development in the areas of: effective progress monitoring, standards-based high yield instructional strategies, differentiated whole group instruction, and rotational models in all content areas.

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

To address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities, Wedgefield will have three instructional coaches who will work with teachers during weekly PLCs , offer targeted intervention supports to students, and build capacity with teachers on high yield instructional best practices by implementing a co-teach model. Wedgefield also has two ESE teachers to work with students with disabilities during small group targeted instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Current End of the Year (EOY) data predicts 18% of Students With Disabilities (SWD) to be proficient in ELA with 49% of SWD earning a learning gain in ELA. Data also predicts 15% of SWD to be proficient in math with 41% of SWD earning a learning gain in math. SWD is Wedgefield's data component with the greatest area of need.

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency for SWD will increase from 18% to 35% on the 2021-2022 ELA Florida State Assessment. Math Proficiency will increase from 15% to 35% on the 2021-2022 math Florida State Assessment.

Monitoring: Classroom and special education teachers will collaborate to create individualized instructional goals for Wedgefield's SWD. Once instructional goals have been established, they will evaluate and make ongoing adjustments to students' instructional programs by engaging in ongoing data collection using curriculum-based measures, monthly progress monitoring assessments, and informal classroom assessments. During weekly PLCs classroom teachers and special education teachers will study their practice to improve student learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Randall Longhouse (randall.longhouse@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Wedgefield will increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports to SWD while providing intensive instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Scaffolded supports for our SWD will temporary assist our students so they can successfully complete tasks that they cannot yet do independently and with a high rate of success. The Classroom teacher and special education teacher will select powerful visual, verbal and written supports; carefully calibrate them to students' performance and understand in relation to learning tasks; use them flexibly; evaluate their effectiveness; and gradually remove them once they are no longer needed. Classroom and special education teachers will also match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student's learning. Wedgefield's classroom and special education teachers will group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. Teachers will collaborate during weekly and monthly PLC meetings to monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly.

Action Steps to Implement

Classroom teachers and special education teachers will meet weekly during PLCs to plan for effective scaffolds and intensive standards-based instruction for our SWD.

Person Responsible Nicole Booth (nicole.herber@ocps.net)

Coaches and administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor instruction and high yield strategies. Actionable feedback will be given based on walkthrough observations using the iObservation coaching tool and school-based walkthrough tool.

Person Responsible Randall Longhouse (randall.longhouse@ocps.net)

Classroom teachers and special education teachers will meet monthly to track and monitor SWD data.

Person Responsible Randall Longhouse (randall.longhouse@ocps.net)

Acceleration tutoring will be offered to SWD twice weekly to help close achievement gaps.

Person Responsible Ranji Vanmali (ranji.vanmali@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 2020-2021 FSA data indicates that 42% of students in the bottom quartile made a learning gain in ELA and 43% of students in the bottom quartile earning a learning gain in math. Learning gains for students in the bottom quartile is one of Wedgefield's lowest data components.

Measurable Outcome: As a result of focusing on the instructional practice in small group instruction, learning gains for students in the bottom quartile will increase from 42% to 65% in ELA and from 43% to 65% in math based on 2021-2022 FSA data.

Monitoring: Weekly PLCs will be implemented to build systems to analyze data, implement instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments to improve student outcomes for students in the bottom quartile. Teachers will be utilizing an item analysis to determine gaps and deficits based upon standards. During PLCs teachers will collaborate with instructional coaches to create flexible student groups based on targeted areas of need. Teachers will then address content gaps during small group instruction in the math and ELA blocks as well as the math intervention and ELA intervention block. Administration will analyze instructional practices during small group instruction by conducting daily walkthroughs to monitor for high yield instructional best practices. Monthly data meetings will be conducted to track and monitor progress for students in the bottom quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Randall Longhouse (randall.longhouse@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize small group instructional time to address achievement gaps for students in the bottom quartile leading to an increase in learning gains in both ELA and math. While in their small groups, students will be provided scaffolded supports to help process new content, examine their reasoning, and revise their knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The flexible grouping of students ensures that targeted students (bottom quartile and students with disabilities) are receiving the systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction based on their needs. While in small groups, students will use conative skills necessary for understanding and collaboration with their peers will allow students to extend their learning by enhancing procedural skills and deepening their knowledge of the content.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers, instructional coaches, and administration will meet weekly during PLCs to disaggregate student data, target students in need of re-teaching and plan for standards based small group instruction in the ELA and math blocks as well as in the ELA and math intervention blocks.

Person Responsible Sarah Becker (101800@ocps.net)

Instructional coaches and administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor small group instruction for best practices and high yield strategies. Teachers will be given actionable feedback based on walkthrough observations using the iObservation coaching tool. Based on walkthrough data, differentiated professional development will be offered in the areas of data disaggregation, flexible grouping, small group instruction and effective monitoring of student understanding during small group instruction.

Person Responsible Nicole Booth (nicole.herber@ocps.net)

Administration will meet monthly with teachers to track and monitor students in the bottom quartile and students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Randall Longhouse (randall.longhouse@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school’s culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: Students’ and families’ perceptions of the overall social and learning climate of the school and students’ overall sense of belonging.

Measurable Outcome: Based on 2020-2021 Panorama data, 69% of students and families indicated a positive perception of the overall social and learning climate of the school. As a result of focusing on this strategy, students’ and families’ positive perception of the overall social and learning climate will increase from 69% to 80% on the 2021-2022 Panorama survey data.

Monitoring: Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and Panorama survey data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change.

Action Steps to Implement

Wedgefield will implement a new school-wide SEL curriculum, Second-Step. Wedgefield will create a school-based SEL leadership team to ensure all teachers receive training on the implementation of our school-wide SEL curriculum. The SEL team will also create a training plan that leverages the trained school team members to train all necessary stakeholders in implementation of the curriculum

Person Responsible Audra Gefter (audra.gefter@ocps.net)

Our SELL team will collect and analyze school climate data through the use of quarterly needs assessments, daily check-ins (using rhythm program), and Panorama survey data to determine how social and emotional learning impacts the students’ learning with a focus on student achievement in ELA and math.

Person Responsible Nicole Booth (nicole.herber@ocps.net)

Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey by strengthening communication, building community and creating connections.

Person Responsible Sue Ann Besaw (42162@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

2019-2020 behavior and discipline data indicates that Wedgefield ranked 233 out of 313 combination schools statewide. Wedgefield reported 1.9 incidents per 100 students compared to the state average of 1.6 incidents per 100 students. The primary area of concern will be Wedgefield's in-school and out-of-school suspension rates and the secondary concern will be incidents involving bullying and harassment. For the 2021-2022 school year Wedgefield will implement a Positive Behavior Support (PBS) approach to improve the social, emotional and academic outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities and students from underrepresented groups. Ongoing professional development for teachers will include supportive, inclusive, and effective strategies that address student misbehavior with alternatives to suspension that teach responsibility, including restorative justice programs. To address bullying and harassment incidents Wedgefield will first create a safe school climate by establishing a culture of inclusion and respect that welcomes all students. Through our PBS program students will be rewarded when they show thoughtfulness and respect for peers, adults, and the school. Students will also be educated about bullying and harassment through weekly Child Safety and Teen Safety Matters guidance lessons taught by our guidance counselors. Schoolwide discipline data will be monitored and analyzed through monthly behavior leadership meetings and climate and culture data will be analyzed through student Panorama survey results.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works

with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

Since the inception of Wedgefield School, the community has played an active role in creating an engaging learning environment for their children. Wedgefield leadership, teachers, and staff communicate with families in a variety of ways. To keep parents apprised of school activities, important dates, current updates, and information, we utilize our school website, the OCPS Connect Orange, social media platforms, and the marquee at the entrance of the school. In addition to the OCPS Progress Reports and Report Cards, parents are kept informed of their child's progress through Skyward, phone calls, emails, notes in planners, Canvas learning platform, and parent/teacher conferences. At the beginning of the year families are invited to both Meet the Teacher and Open House in an effort to build positive teacher-parent relationships. Throughout the year Wedgefield holds monthly SAC and PTSA meetings to build positive relationships with all stakeholders in an effort help support and fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of Students. Wedgefield also has over thirty active partners in education who also support the school's mission and needs of students.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$3,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		239-Other	1861 - Wedgefield School	General Fund		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Sounds Sensible and S.P.I.R.E. (Reading Intervention Kits) will be used as a resource for SWD.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$7,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		239-Other	1861 - Wedgefield School	General Fund		\$4,500.00
			<i>Notes: Phonics for Reading will be used during small group instruction to support students in the bottom quartile in ELA.</i>			
		239-Other	1861 - Wedgefield School	General Fund		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Support Coach materials were purchased to use during small group instructional for students in the bottom quartile in ELA.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$3,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		239-Other	1861 - Wedgefield School	General Fund		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Rhythm will be purchased and used as a daily check-in for students and teachers.</i>			

	Total: \$14,500.00
--	----------------------------------