

Orange County Public Schools

Wetherbee Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Wetherbee Elementary

701 E WETHERBEE RD, Orlando, FL 32824

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

Demographics

Principal: John Williams S

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (70%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%)
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	N/A
* 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 1/24/2023.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Wetherbee Elementary

701 E WETHERBEE RD, Orlando, FL 32824

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	75%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hamann, Jacqueline	Principal	The Principal (Jacqueline Hamann): Sets the vision, mission and expectations for the school; oversees digital implementation, provides supervision of all instruction and accelerates the momentum by setting high expectations for the use and success of the MTSS process. She ensures the baseline outlook for the development of MTSS and the successful implementation of the process. The principal also ensures support and documentation to increase academic/behavioral instruction at the various tiers. In addition, the principal examines MTSS plans and activities with parents and stakeholders.
Brinkman, Katie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal (Katie Brinkman): Mrs. Brinkman will work with the principal to develop and facilitate school initiatives, monitor student achievement and instructional delivery of the standards, conduct coaching and evaluative observations, provide effective actionable feedback that promotes teacher growth and expertise, and facilitate discussions focused on progress monitoring data.
Alma, Lizette	Instructional Coach	The Reading Coach (Lizette Alma): Provides guidance on 2-5 reading plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans. Assists in determining appropriate intervention and progress monitoring materials. Keeps an inventory of core curriculum and intervention materials. Coordinates all testing for the school.
Mogerman, Kimberly	Math Coach	The Math and Science Coach (Kimberly Mogerman): Provides guidance on 2-5 math and science plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans. Assists in determining appropriate intervention and progress monitoring materials. Keeps an inventory of core curriculum and intervention materials. Supports with all district and state testing for the school.
Felix, Lymarie	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ESOL Curriculum Compliance Teacher (Mrs. Felix) : Monitors school for compliance with Florida State mandates, conducts and coordinates ELL Committee Meetings, conducts aural/oral language testing on students entering the school and follows-up on students needing the Reading/Writing assessment, assesses, evaluates, and monitors the individual progress of each student in the ESOL program and serves as the liaison for the Dual Language Program.
Labega, Ana	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist (Ana Labega): Schedules meetings for ESE students receiving additional support through MTSS, invites participants, ensures coverage for teachers (as

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		needed), conducts and maintains focus of the meeting, sets and monitors time limits, schedules follow-up meetings and invites participants to follow-up meeting(s). Also, she provides guidance on ESE strategies, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, and works with LY students.
Cotto Lopez, Edna	Teacher, ESE	The K/1 Reading Coach (Kourtney Koza): Provides guidance on K & 1 reading plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans.
Koza, Kourtney	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The K & 1 Coach (Kourtney Koza): Provides guidance on K-5 reading plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based lesson planning, and supports tiered intervention plans.
Adorno, Illia	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The MTSS Coach (Illia Adorno): Provides guidance on K-5 reading and math intervention plans, analyzes data, participates in progress monitoring, assists teachers with data-based decisions, and supports tiered intervention plans. Provides coaching and training to colleagues on MTSS implementation. Supports teachers in identifying student needs and provides appropriate interventions as needed. Works with students that are receiving Tier 3 services.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/14/2022, John Williams S

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.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

987

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

11

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	43	39	20	29	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	26	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	8	24	17	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/18/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	64	165	196	165	177	193	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	960
Attendance below 90 percent	16	26	24	24	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	64	165	196	165	177	193	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	960
Attendance below 90 percent	16	26	24	24	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	68%	56%	56%				64%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						60%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						45%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	72%	46%	50%				70%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	76%						67%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%						39%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	61%	59%				60%	56%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	57%	3%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	63%	1%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	60	57	27	57	53	10				
ELL	59	71	64	66	73	74	61				
ASN	75	69		94	88		94				
BLK	60	75	62	55	84	82	47				
HSP	67	69	61	71	73	70	67				
WHT	67	70		74	79		71				
FRL	60	69	57	66	71	62	58				

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	9	17	18	17	33	30					
ELL	58	60	60	66	69	59	61				
ASN	74	54		79	62		93				
BLK	57	47		52	53		41				
HSP	69	69	56	69	66	56	71				
WHT	75			78			67				
FRL	60	51	15	63	56	38	60				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	36	27	19	7						
ELL	58	63	51	66	64	48	52				
ASN	91	80		88	80						
BLK	45	45	33	66	67	46	48				
HSP	65	61	47	68	67	41	61				
WHT	67	71		77	68		56				
FRL	59	61	48	64	67	37	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	69
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	554
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	67
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All grade level data has shown increases based on ELA and Math FSA scores in learning gains and bottom quartile students, except for 4th grade ELA learning gains. Science data remained consistent at 69% from last year's scores and has shown an increase in scores over the past 4 years.

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

The data components that showed the greatest need for improvement during the 2021-2022 school year at Wetherbee were the proficiency levels in 3rd and 5th grade in both ELA and math. Another area of focus in 4th grade ELA learning gains, decreasing 7% from the previous year.

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

The contributing factor was strong focus on standards-based, Tier 1 instruction to ensure solid core instruction. Strong Tier 2 instruction in both ELA and Math also contributed to the gains that were made. New actions include a shift in the MTSS monitoring approach that will include progress monitoring tools and more frequent data collections.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement during the 2021-2022 school year was ELA learning gains & math learning gains and math bottom quartile learning gains.

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

Contributing facts for this increase included focusing on structured, collaborative planning time using the backwards design approach, as well as determining the most effective delivery strategies. Data meetings were held to discuss the standard-based assessment data, which was used to make instructional decisions. Instructional focus calendars will continue to be used this year to embed reteaching, acceleration and hands-on learning. All students will receive tier 2 interventions based on standards not mastered on the unit assessment.

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

In order to accelerate learning this year, we will need to develop a system for monitoring of core instruction and making adjustments based on the outcomes of that monitoring. Teachers will be

frontloading vocabulary to increase exposure to standards-based academic language. Teachers will use resources to provide enrichment/tiered interventions, after school tutoring programs and daily student access to high-quality grade level materials.

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.

Professional development will be based on teacher and staff needs throughout the year that include: small group instruction, SIPP's instruction, vocabulary, text-dependent questioning and utilizing manipulatives within lessons.

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

Students each have individual goals to meet. Based on beginning of the year scores, students will receive instruction based on their individual needs. Leadership team members will push into classrooms and pull-out groups for small group instruction. Tutoring programs and clubs will be offered to provide rigorous activities to focus on acceleration and challenging all students.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

The ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities showed a streak of low performing data on the 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 FSA Assessment. Based on the 2021-2022 ESSA Data, the Federal Index for Students with Disabilities was 21%. The 2021-2022 data scored at 44%, showing a 23% increase. Wetherbee will continue to make this subgroup an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Wetherbee plans to achieve 47% in this subgroup on the F.A.S.T. Assessment, which is a 3% increase.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored daily using formative assessments in the classroom and during ESE resource support. Student achievement data will be monitored at regular school-based data meetings using i-Ready and common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Edna Cotto Lopez (edna.cottolopez@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers and ESE resource teacher will effectively implement small group instruction focused on student deficiencies for this subgroup in order to increase student achievement. Teachers will plan using appropriate resources, text-based questioning, scaffolded instruction and DPLC strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

These strategies were selected to ensure student deficiencies are met during interventions and small group instruction. By aligning resources to student needs, using strategies learned through professional development and supporting teachers with implementation, we will see an increase in the achievement of these students.

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.

Utilize a consistent framework for intervention and small group instruction, including appropriately aligned resources.

Person Responsible

Lizette Alma (lizette.alma@ocps.net)

Provide Tier 3 interventions to support ESE students to target goals and deficiencies, including foundational skills across all grade levels.

Person Responsible

Ilia Adorno (ilia.adorno@ocps.net)

Increase emphasis on targeted small group instruction to meet IEP goals.

Person Responsible

Edna Cotto Lopez (edna.cottolopez@ocps.net)

In response to ESSA outcomes regarding students with learning disabilities, teachers of students with disabilities will provide targeted lessons aligned to areas of need.

Person Responsible Lizette Alma (lizette.alma@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

The overall ELA proficiency decreased by 2% (67%) from the previous year. ELA 4th grade learning gains also decreased by 7%.

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

Wetherbee plans to achieve 70% in proficiency in ELA on the F.A.S.T Assessment, which is a 3% increase. In addition, Wetherbee will focus on increasing 4th grade learning gains in ELA.

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

The area of focus will be monitored weekly through instructional focus walks conducted by school-based coaches and administration. Additionally, student achievement data will be monitored at regular school-based data meetings using i-Ready and SBUAs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lizette Alma (lizette.alma@ocps.net)

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

Teachers will effectively implement intervention groups and small group instruction focused on student deficiencies for ELA based on formative and summative assessment data. Teachers will incorporate resources that are appropriate for student differentiation, text-based questioning, text-based writing and other DPLC strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

These strategies was selected to ensure student deficiencies are met during intervention and small group instruction. By providing appropriate resources that are aligned to the students needs, using strategies learned through district professional development and supporting teachers with implementation, we will see an increase in the achievement of these students.

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.

Utilize a consistent framework for intervention and small group instruction, including appropriately aligned resources.

Person Responsible

Lizette Alma (lizette.alma@ocps.net)

Provide Tier 3 interventions to support lowest quartile and target areas of deficiencies, including foundational skills across all grade levels.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

Increase emphasis on Accelerated Reader program daily.

Person Responsible

Kristin Thomas (kristin.thomas@ocps.net)

Provide after school tutoring for students falling in the lowest quartile for ELA.

Person Responsible Lizette Alma (lizette.alma@ocps.net)

No description entered

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.

Wetherbee Elementary will continue to implement the District Professional Learning Community initiative which focuses on Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies to support relationship-building, problem-solving and respect in order to improve the learning environment and increase student achievement. These strategies will be utilized in all content areas and collaborative planning time will be used to address their implementation. Meetings will be held to analyze standard based assessment data as well as qualitative data to assist teachers in making instructional decisions and improve their learning environments.

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

Creating a positive school culture through collaborative efforts among staff, parents and students is key to increasing academic growth for students. 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. By incorporating parents as partners in their children's education as well as increase the opportunities for all stakeholders to better communicate, the school will produce the positive environment needed to foster learning. Parents and community members are invited to join ADDitions, PTO and SAC. Students are encouraged to participate in opportunities that will facilitate the development of enjoyment in the school process, leadership skills and ownership of the school community. Our School Based Leadership Team and Partners in Ed Coordinator works to make connections to services available in the community to support school initiatives and student needs in both academic and social/emotional needs.