

Seminole County Public Schools

Wekiva Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 19 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Wekiva Elementary School

1450 E WEKIVA TRL, Longwood, FL 32779

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0651>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Wekiva works as a team to promote a safe and positive learning environment for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wekiva is a special place where teachers, staff, and students can laugh, grow, and learn together.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|------------------------|--|
| Schreiner, Keaton | Principal | Lead the team by creating agendas and facilitate dialogue focused on student achievement and safety through scheduled and consistent weekly meetings. Conduct weekly classroom walk-throughs, providing feedback on teacher instruction. |
| Lester, Kristina | Assistant Principal | Compile, analyze and disaggregate student data and update through Google Document. Conduct weekly classroom walk-throughs, providing feedback on teacher instruction. |
| Shannon, Alex | Instructional Coach | Facilitate and manage MTSS meetings. Organize and facilitate PLC/PD meetings for READING and SOCIAL STUDIES related content/updates. |
| Gabrovic, Julie | Teacher, K-12 | Organize and facilitate PLC/PD meetings for MATH and SCIENCE related content/updates. Serve as NEST lead teacher. |
| Williams, Tara | Administrative Support | Manage facilities and non-instructional staff. Serve as primary discipline designee. Handle all school management unrelated to instructional practice. |
| Bingham, Melanie | School Counselor | Assist with MTSS meetings by monitoring Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Schedule facilitate, lead and organize Student Study Team (SST) meetings weekly. |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Parents and the community are key stakeholders in the review of our annual plan to improve. Our PTA and SAC are involved in the process of parent and community input in the way of monthly meetings year round. As we develop our School Improvement Plan annually, I make it a point to address the SIP and seek their input and validate our current focus on goals and the direction our school desires to improve upon. Our 5 Essentials survey results are also reflected on as we use the feedback to shape the supportive environment.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards during our weekly Leadership meetings each Monday. This will be a standing topic of discussion throughout the school year as we monitor students’ progress in comparison to the goals set forth in the SIP. Revision to the plan, if needed, will occur if our students are not closing the gap as anticipated.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 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 |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 41% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 37% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: A |
| | 2019-20: A |
| | 2018-19: A |
| | 2017-18: A |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 10 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 4 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 8 | 16 | 6 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|---|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 7 | 12 | 3 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 66 | 61 | 53 | 78 | 65 | 56 | 78 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 66 | | | 66 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51 | | | 57 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 73 | 64 | 59 | 75 | 46 | 50 | 73 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 68 | | | 61 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54 | | | 33 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 80 | 65 | 54 | 80 | 65 | 59 | 79 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 62 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 45 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 62 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 75 | 77 | 59 | 80 | | | 100 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 72 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 361 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 69 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 552 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 24 | Yes | 2 | 1 |
| ELL | 61 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 74 | | | |
| BLK | 39 | Yes | 2 | |
| HSP | 73 | | | |
| MUL | 76 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | | | |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| FRL | 55 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 60 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 76 | | | |
| BLK | 31 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| HSP | 66 | | | |
| MUL | 89 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | | | |
| FRL | 59 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 66 | | | 73 | | | 80 | | | | | 75 |
| SWD | 22 | | | 37 | | | 15 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 44 | | | 63 | | | | | | | 3 | 75 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 65 | | | 82 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 53 | | | 24 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | 67 | | | 71 | | | 83 | | | | 5 | 82 |
| MUL | 68 | | | 84 | | | | | | | 2 | |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | | | 75 | | | 78 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 48 | | | 57 | | | 74 | | | | 4 | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 78 | 66 | 51 | 75 | 68 | 54 | 80 | | | | | 80 |
| SWD | 35 | 41 | 39 | 31 | 45 | 48 | 31 | | | | | |
| ELL | 58 | 67 | | 63 | 53 | | 40 | | | | | 80 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | 50 | | 85 | 92 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 20 | | 24 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 77 | 70 | 65 | 67 | 62 | 50 | 69 | | | | | |
| MUL | 93 | | | 85 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 69 | 51 | 82 | 71 | 63 | 89 | | | | | |
| FRL | 68 | 58 | 48 | 61 | 65 | 50 | 66 | | | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 78 | 66 | 57 | 73 | 61 | 33 | 79 | | | | | 100 |
| SWD | 29 | 39 | 36 | 27 | 22 | 33 | 33 | | | | | |
| ELL | 68 | | | 64 | | | | | | | | 100 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 69 | | | 88 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | | | 20 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 75 | 52 | 55 | 64 | 64 | 45 | 63 | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 81 | 72 | 50 | 80 | 65 | 20 | 87 | | | | | |
| FRL | 74 | 65 | 67 | 57 | 59 | 32 | 70 | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 61% | 8% | 54% | 15% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 76% | 66% | 10% | 58% | 18% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 60% | 5% | 50% | 15% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 66% | 34% | 54% | 46% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 76% | 66% | 10% | 59% | 17% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 74% | 68% | 6% | 61% | 13% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 44% | 16% | 55% | 5% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 81% | 64% | 17% | 51% | 30% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Wekiva's greatest need for improvement based off progress monitoring and 2023 state assessments, is in the areas of both Reading and Math. Although the overall percentage of students that demonstrate proficiency is above state and district averages, there is still room for improvement

The continuing factors to this need for improvement are the decrease in the amount of students that are demonstrating proficiency. New actions that need to be taken to address this need for improvement include, deeper data dives, continuous feedback loops on teacher instruction, and increased PLC work

across subject areas to address not only grade level students as a whole, but individual students who are demonstrating little to no growth according to progress monitoring.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was in the area of ELA, specifically the 3rd grade. Factors that may have contributed to the drop in the number of students at proficiency range from their limited mastery of 2nd grade standards and lack of urgency when analyzing data and taking action with planning during our PLCs.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All data components are above the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

2023 Science L3+ increased by 2, (81%) landing Wekiva at the #1 spot compared to all other Elementary school in SCPS.

One of the largest contributing factors to the upward trend of improvement in the area of Science is our teacher leader/instructional coach and 5th grade Science teachers that take the time and utilize their resources to meet the needs of all learners. Students at Wekiva receive hands on, practical instruction that translates into true understanding of science related content. The implementation of Science journals where students take copious notes during instruction lead to knowledge gained and retrieval possible on statewide assessments.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

- Increase PLC planning and implementation of well-planned lessons
- Provide and plan for intervention with Tier 2, Tier 3, and our ESE students
- Ensure our Tier 1 students our monitored closely for regression to ensure proficiency on 3rd grade standards

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities and Black/African American students. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities and Black/African American students.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keaton Schreiner (keaton_schreiner@scps.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention, iReady or iStation, Success for All – FastTrack Phonics (at Title 1 schools), Reading Mastery, FastForward, Corrective Reading, Quick Reads and Elements of Reading.

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, DreamBox, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.

All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

What do we want all students to do?

We want ALL students to attain a strong foundation in reading, writing, math and science. Additionally, fostering critical thinking, creativity, problem-solving skills, and effective communication are crucial to prepare them for success. Cultivating a love for learning and promoting a growth mindset, especially for our struggling learners, is also vital to their overall development as we strive to close the gap compared to their on-grade level peers.

How will we know if they learn it?

Assessing student learning involves various methods, including formative and summative assessments. Providing ongoing feedback loops during the learning process is key in knowing if they are learning concepts. Frequent and consistent PLCs will take place to analyze student data for all subject areas.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

Communication and ongoing dialogue between student, teacher and support staff is essential when keeping track of their growth and identifying areas that may need further intervention.

Person Responsible: Keaton Schreiner (keaton_schreiner@scps.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

5 Essentials Survey indicators for trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism will increase to or remain Well Organized.

Monitoring:

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keaton Schreiner (keaton_schreiner@scps.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Decrease the amount of students that do not feel that they have a TRUSTED ADULT to talk to if they have a concern.

Weekly "huddles" will take place in classrooms to monitor the culture/climate amongst classmates. Professional Development will be provided for teachers in September.

Collective Responsibility is an area of weakness that will be addressed and improved upon during the

2023-2023 school year.

Increased PLC time focused on students "as a whole" will be planned weekly. Teachers will not longer look at "their class" but rather "our grade level".

Person Responsible: Keaton Schreiner (keaton_schreiner@scps.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).