Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary

4550 BELLE TERRE PKWY, Palm Coast, FL 32164

www.flaglerschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Anna Crawford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Flagler County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Mission: Flagler County Public Schools ensures educational success through high expectations and innovative thinking in a safe learning environment to empower students to reach their full potential as responsible, ethical, and productive citizens in a diverse and changing world.

District Guiding Principles:
Children First
Trust and Respect for All
Empower Others
Teamwork
Excellence, Quality, and Consistency
Commitment to Individual Needs
Get to "YES"

Provide the school's vision statement

Vision: As a courageous, innovative leader in education, Flagler Schools will be the Nation's premier learning organization where ALL students graduate as socially responsible citizens with the skills necessary to reach their maximum potential.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crawford, Anna	Principal	-Provide leadership and coaching to empower critical thinkers, enthusiastic readers and ethical use of information. -Develop and build student rapport and model positive relationships with teachers and students. -Enhance the culture and climate of the school by focusing on the mission and vision. -Develop and implement a Student Services Team that provides links to community mental health resources and targeted support and intervention.
Keeling, Marcy	Assistant Principal	-Provide leadership and coaching to empower critical thinkers, enthusiastic readers and ethical use of information. -Develop and build student rapport and model positive relationships with teachers and students. -Guide instruction and curriculum planning and monitoring. -Oversee Title 1 programs and documentation. -Monitor multi-tiered services of support for fidelity of implementation.
Terry, Fred	Assistant Principal	-Ensure safety and security of campus and students. -Supporting classroom management practices in the classroom. -Develop and implement a Student Services Team that provides links to community mental health resources and targeted support and intervention.
Carroll, Jennifer	Other	-Provide targeted academic support and documentation through MTSS process. -Monitor and Intervene with Early Warning Systems. -Assist in the facilitation of student eligibility meetings.
Rizzo, Teresa	Instructional Coach	-Provide targeted instructional coaching with all teachers and a focus on new teachers in the the Florida Standards and school goals.
Ossler, Tara	Instructional Coach	-Provide targeted instructional coaching with all teachers and a focus on new teachers in the the Florida Standards and school goals.
Lloyd-Miller, Rashawnda	Guidance Counselor	-Engage and interact with the school community in a positive manner. -Serve on the Student Services Support Team that provides links to community mental health resources and targeted support and intervention. -Provides focused small groups for students to assist with student social emotional needs.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Majewski, Katie	Guidance Counselor	-Engage and interact with the school community in a positive manner. -Serve on the Student Services Support Team that provides links to community mental health resources and targeted support and intervention. -Provides focused small groups for students to assist with student social emotional needs.
Johnson, Lyndon	Other	-Monitor and Intervene with Early Warning Systems. -Provide targeted behavior support through MTSS process. -Support behavior management practices in the classroom.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Anna Crawford

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.*
8

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged

(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	87	116	100	131	111	121	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	802
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	16	7	15	11	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	1	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	16	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 5/29/2020

Prior Year - 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	120	120	139	119	128	146	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	940
Attendance below 90 percent	21	13	12	7	13	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	8	9	7	15	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	22	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	26	47	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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	2	1	3	22	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	2	5	5	3	7	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	120	120	139	119	128	146	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	940
Attendance below 90 percent	21	13	12	7	13	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	8	9	7	15	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	22	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	26	47	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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	2	1	3	22	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	2	5	5	3	7	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	63%	57%	56%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	60%	58%	54%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	53%	53%	38%	43%	48%
Math Achievement	61%	66%	63%	62%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains	58%	62%	62%	57%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	49%	51%	43%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	48%	55%	53%	49%	56%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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	2019	63%	68%	-5%	58%	5%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	56%	1%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	48%	58%	-10%	56%	-8%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
06	2019	64%	62%	2%	54%	10%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	72%	72%	0%	62%	10%
	2018	67%	69%	-2%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	60%	-10%	64%	-14%
	2018	56%	63%	-7%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2019	44%	58%	-14%	60%	-16%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
06	2019	74%	67%	7%	55%	19%
	2018	64%	65%	-1%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	47	48	32	49	45	21				
ELL	53	72	77	69	78	60	60				
ASN	58			75							
BLK	40	52	56	44	51	50	10				
HSP	56	62	53	62	63	37	54				
MUL	69	67		69	48						
WHT	65	62	55	63	58	41	55				
FRL	53	59	51	56	55	44	37				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	32	23	24	36	34	17				
ELL	42	39		56	39						
ASN	67	50		100	60						
BLK	37	44	38	42	48	32	28				
HSP	60	58	38	55	57	47	44				
MUL	63	52		72	56						
WHT	58	56	35	66	60	49	56				
FRL	51	51	35	58	55	39	45				

ESSA Data
This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	67
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	59
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

During the 18-19 school year the component with the lowest performance was grade five math with only 44 percent of students scoring a level 3 or higher. This component saw an 8 percent decline from prior year scores. This cohort of students has seen declines over the 17-18 and 18-19 school years when compared to self, district, and state. Changes in instructional personal occurred mid-year contributing to declines in academic performance for this cohort. Additionally, changes in curriculum resources acted as a contributing factor.

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

During the 18-19 school year the component with the greatest decline in performance was grade five math with only 44 percent of students earning a level 3 or higher in 2019 while 52% of students had scores of a level 3 or higher in 2018, accounting for an eight percent decline from prior year. Changes in instructional personal occurred mid-year contributing to declines in academic performance for this cohort. Additionally, changes in curriculum resources acted as a contributing factor.

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

During the 18-19 school year the component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was grade five math. Only 44 percent of students in grade five scored level 3 or higher in 2019 at the school level while 60 percent of students in the same category scored a level 3 or higher at the state level. The gap between school and state accounted for a 16 point discrepancy. Changes in instructional personal occurred mid-year contributing to declines in academic performance for this cohort. Additionally, changes in curriculum resources acted as a contributing factor.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was grade six math with a 10 point gain between the 2018 and 2019 school year increasing the number of students earning a level 3 or higher from 64 percent to 74 percent. This group has had consistency in instructional personnel leading to curriculum knowledge as well as organized intervention planning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two potential areas of concern include grade five and grade six math. During the 18-19 school year grade four math, (current 5th grade students), achievement dropped from 56 percent to 50 percent. This drop in achievement is indicated in 47 students scoring at level 1 in the current sixth grade population. The 18-19 fifth grade also showed decreased achievement from 52 percent scoring a level 3 or higher to 44 percent. Both grades five and six will require targeted math support.

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

1. Percentages of students with disability (SWD) scoring a level 3 or higher and increasing learning gains.
2. Grades 5 and 6 math performance (level 3 or higher).
3. Lowest Quartile English Language Arts (ELA) learning gains percentages.
4. Percentages of Black/African American students scoring a level 3 or higher and increasing learning gains..

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	It is important for all students to make continued progress of grade level learning gains, ensuring the path to on time graduation. At the elementary level, this is done by students working towards gaining proficiency on state tested subject areas. By focusing on standards aligned instruction, teachers will strategically plan lessons focused on the depth of knowledge required for each state standard.
Measureable Outcome:	If we implement school-wide weekly professional learning communities that include instructional coaching on the various elements of the standards aligned instructional plan (lesson plans, distributed summarizing, writing, graphic organizers, vocabulary instruction, H.O.T questions, text structure and rubrics) for all grade levels, then students will achieve one years growth in one years time in ELA and Math as measured by iReady Diagnostic Typical Growth Report results from windows 1-3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marcy Keeling (keelingm@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly school-wide strategic planning that will include explicit and systematic grade level instructional planning to align all instruction to state standards. The targeted planning will lead to increased learning gains by students in English Language Arts and Math as determined by iReady Typical Growth Reports and FSA data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A professional learning community realizes that its efforts to develop shared mission, vision, and values; engage in collective inquiry; build collaborative teams; take action; and focus on continuous improvement must be assessed on the basis of results rather than intentions. Unless initiatives are subject to ongoing assessment n the basis of tangible results, they represent random groping in the dark rather than purposeful improvement. Peter Senge (1996) nots that the "rationale for any strategy for building a learning organization revolves around the premise that such organizations will produce dramatically improved results"(p.44). Dufour, R. & Eaker, R. Professional Learning Communities at Work: Best Practices for Enhancing Student Achievement. 1998, Solution Tree Press, Bloomington, IN.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate weekly grade level professional learning communities with teachers to provide support in English Language Arts and Math instruction aligned with state standards. These meetings will be facilitated by the instructional coaches.

Person Responsible	Tara Ossler (osslert@flaglerschools.com)

Schedule professional development that includes data analysis and data driven action plans.

Person Responsible	Marcy Keeling (keelingm@flaglerschools.com)

Conduct learning walks with administration, instructional coaches, and instructional staff to gather insight on the implementation of evidence-based practices for delivering standards aligned instruction.

Person Responsible   Marcy Keeling (keelingm@flaglerschools.com)

Provide formal and informal specific professional development opportunities based on deficiencies.

Person Responsible   Teresa Rizzo (rizzot@flaglerschools.com)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Early Warning Systems serves as a tool for identification of students that struggle in four target areas and can be used to provide targeted intervention either behaviorally or academically or both. Many of our EWS indicated students typically fell in our Lowest 25th Percentile. By implementing consistent and continued monitoring, we can identify students that show early warning indicators to ensure that we are effectively providing an appropriate intervention.
Measureable Outcome:	The number of students with one or more suspensions by grade level will decrease from 82 to 72 in one year. The number of students with a course failure in ELA or Math will decrease from 45 to 35. The number of students scoring a level 1 on the FSA will decrease from 133 to 100.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Fred Terry (terryf@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly student service meetings to discuss and monitor attendance rates, suspension rates, and supports for students scoring at the level 1 on FSA or failure in ELA and math courses. Create action plans and put into place as needed as a result of the data shared.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collecting and analyzing the most relevant and predictive data in order to identify student outcome problems, understand the root causes of student outcome problems, and select, implement, and evaluate the impact of intervention supports on improving student outcomes (e.g., graduation rates) is critical. As such, developing and utilizing an EWS within a larger RtI framework is essential to districts' and schools' efforts to prevent academic skill deficits and disengagement from occurring in the first place and to more effectively respond to these issues when they occur. Sarlo, Rebecca. "Early Warning Systems: Moving From Reaction to Prevention." Early Warning Systems: Moving From Reaction to Prevention | RTI Action Network, www.rtinetwork.org/learn/rti-in-secondary-schools/early-warning-systems-moving-from-reaction-to-prevention.

Action Steps to Implement

Communicate to teachers what EWS indicators are and students that are identified through this system.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Carroll (carrollj@flaglerschools.com)

Develop a Student Service Team to include Guidance, School Psychologist, Administration, Behavior Interventionists, MTSS Coordinator.

Person Responsible	Fred Terry (terryf@flaglerschools.com)

Hold weekly Student Service Meeting with an outlined agenda to review EWS student indicators and provide targeted direction for those students to include entry into academic support systems and Mental Health Referrals.

Person Responsible	Fred Terry (terryf@flaglerschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Currently 40 percent of our students with disabilities scored a level 3 or higher on the 18-19 FSA. Research has shown that specific evidence-based instructional practices have proven to be effective when teaching students with disabilities. Implementing these specific instructional practices will address their individual learning needs and increase their achievement across content areas.
Measureable Outcome:	If we implement Evidence-based practices, (i.e. control of task difficulty, teaching in small, interactive groups, using "think alouds", advanced organizers/activate prior knowledge, teach self monitoring, present learning in multiple ways, teach memory strategies, use student interests, collaborate with IEP team), to teach students in grades four through six with disabilities, then student scale score achievement in ELA, Math, and Science will increase on the FSA. Students in grades Kindergarten through third grade will increase the scale score on iReady Diagnostic from window 1 to window 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marcy Keeling (keelingm@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Control of task difficulty 2. Small, interactive groups 3. Think alouds 4. Advanced organizers/activate prior knowledge 5. Self monitoring 6. Presentation of learning in multiple ways 7. Memory strategies 8. Use of student interests 9. Collaboration with IEP team
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Curriculum and instruction are designed to accommodate the full range of student diversity. Individualized supports are provided to students with significant disabilities to enable them to fully participate and make progress within the general education curriculum. Students learn functional or life skills within typical routines in the general education classroom or other inclusive activities and environments. Jorgensen, C.M., McSheehan, M., Schuh, M., & Sonnenmeier, R.M. (2012). ESSENTIAL BEST PRACTICES IN INCLUSIVE SCHOOLS.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide classroom teachers with a copy of the student's current IEP. The classroom teacher and Support Facilitator will collaborate to ensure that they understand the student's academic and/or social/emotional goals as well as their accommodations for classroom assignments/assessments and standardized assessments so that they are being addressed and met by both teachers.

Person Responsible Jennifer Carroll (carrollj@flaglerschools.com)

Progress Monitor three times a year (Fall, Winter, Spring using the iReady ELA & Math Diagnostic Tool, Core Phonics Survey, Standards Mastery Item Analysis). Based on this information, the leadership team and teachers will utilize the instructional resources and

strategies decision tree to identify student needs and adjust differentiated instruction accordingly.

Person Responsible Anna Crawford (crawfordan@flaglerschools.com)

Provide weekly intentional standards-aligned instructional planning sessions with grade-level teams to develop knowledge of evidenced-based backward planning strategies with academic coaches.

Person Responsible Teresa Rizzo (rizzot@flaglerschools.com)

Keep records of classroom visits and feedback provided.

Person Responsible Anna Crawford (crawfordan@flaglerschools.com)

#4. Other specifically relating to Literacy and High Expectations	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Research by Gill and Kozloff (2004) indicated that student's achievement increases faster and at a greater rate when systematic and explicit instruction is provided for all students including those with identified learning difficulties. Utilizing the Florida Reading Initiative (FRI) Conceptual Model in conjunction with the Florida State Standards teachers will focus instruction on the pillars of literacy: Fluency, Language, Knowledge, and Metacognition (Lane & Hayes, 2018) and evidence-based instructional strategies.
Measureable Outcome:	If we implement a school-wide systematic and explicit literacy program of instruction with a continuous progress monitoring of student performance used to drive instruction based on outcome data. Student's achievement will reflect one years growth in one years time in ELA as measured by iReady Diagnostic Growth Report results from windows 1-3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marcy Keeling (keelingm@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Provide weekly intentional standards-aligned instructional planning sessions with grade-level teams to develop knowledge of evidenced-based backward planning strategies with academic coaches. 2. Conduct learning walk-throughs by administration and instructional coaches providing specific and school-wide feedback. 3. Provide formal James Pattern Literacy Project Through the University of Florida Literacy Initiative and aligned informal professional development opportunities with Instructional Coaches. 4. Utilize iReady Diagnostic data to identify performance trends between assessment windows to communicate and inform instructional practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The term scientifically based reading instruction was first defined in the Reading Excellence Act of 1998 as "the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain valid knowledge relevant to reading development, reading instruction, and reading difficulties. According to Stanovich and Stonvich (2003), reflective teachers use scientific thinking every day. Teachers "inquire into their own proactive and examine their own classrooms to find out what works best for them and their students"

Action Steps to Implement

Progress Monitoring three times a year (Fall, Winter, Spring using the iReady ELA & Math Diagnostic Tool. The leadership team and teachers will identify student needs and adjust differentiated instruction accordingly based on this information.

Person Responsible	Anna Crawford (crawfordan@flaglerschools.com)

Conduct weekly collaborative planning sessions to gain knowledge of evidence-based backward planning strategies with academic coaches.

Person Responsible	Teresa Rizzo (rizzot@flaglerschools.com)

Establish a bi-weekly schedule for administration to evaluate lesson plans for essential questions, higher order thinking questions, vocabulary instruction, and differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible   Marcy Keeling (keelingm@flaglerschools.com)

Keep records of classroom visits and feedback provided.

Person Responsible   Anna Crawford (crawfordan@flaglerschools.com)

#5. Other specifically relating to Acceleration	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At the elementary level, it is important to monitor and provide acceleration opportunities to students that perform above the proficiency rate in progress monitoring and standardized assessment. We will focus on grouping students to provide acceleration opportunities within the flagship program: STEM Academy and DREAMS classes.
Measureable Outcome:	If we implement accelerated classroom profiles for high achieving students, then students will achieve one years growth in one years time in ELA and Math as measured by iReady Diagnostic Growth Report results from windows 1-3. This will be implemented as the DREAMS program (Kindergarten to 5th Grade) and the STEM Academy in Grades 4,5 and 6. Sixth grade students have the opportunity for advanced classes to meet the secondary criteria.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rashawnda Lloyd-Miller (lloydmillerr@flaglerschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be identified as prospective accelerated students who will benefit from a more enriched learning environment utilizing grade level formative and summative assessment data
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With careful attention to the cognitive, social, and emotional needs of prospective accelerated students, teachers and administrators can recommend from an array of practices with the confidence that the child will not only survive but will thrive in a more challenging learning environment. Rodgers, K. B., Kimpston, R. D., (1992) The Acceleration of Students: What We Do vs. What We Know.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be identified and grouped into one of the two acceleration opportunities (STEM and DREAMS).

Person Responsible	Rashawnda Lloyd-Miller (lloydmillerr@flaglerschools.com)

Communicate to teachers the expectations of the DREAMS Classrooms and STEM Academy classrooms and provide support through regular collaborative planning meetings facilitated by instructional coaches.

Person Responsible	Marcy Keeling (keelingm@flaglerschools.com)

Administration and academic coaches will conduct learning walks to review implementation strategies for DREAMS classrooms and STEM Academy classrooms.

Person Responsible	Anna Crawford (crawfordan@flaglerschools.com)

Analyze learning gains from I Ready Diagnostic assessments and FSA for the specified populations to modify programs if needed.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Carroll (carrollj@flaglerschools.com)

#6. Other specifically relating to Enhanced Acceleration	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The National Research Council (2004) states the disparity in achievement between white and non-white students can be seen in the difference in standardized test scores, grade point averages, graduation rates, and college admission data. At the elementary level, specifically at Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary School achievement on the 18-19 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) for African American students is significantly lower at 40% proficiency in Reading and 44% proficiency in Math compared to white peers with proficiency at 65% and 63% respectively. Recent research indicates that four factors greatly impact achievement among marginalized students:" teacher quality, rigor of curriculum, student engagement in academic tasks, and a school culture of high expectations" (Delpit, 2012; Boykin & Noguera, 2011; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Howard, 2010; Landsman, 2004).
Measureable Outcome:	If we develop a culture of high expectations for students, providing teachers with rigorous curriculum resources and training for intentionally planned engaging academic tasks and regular progress monitoring, as well as professional development on cultural and socioeconomic sensitivity then African American students will achieve one years growth in one years time in ELA and Math as measured by iReady Diagnostic Growth Report results from windows 1-3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional staff will be provided professional development aimed at understanding brain-based research (University of Florida Literacy Initiative) along with high-quality standards-based curriculum resources (Curriculum Associates iReady) and planned instruction (90 minute reading block and 60 minute math block) and intervention times (Pride Time) built into the master schedule. Implementing these measures will create a culture of high expectations for students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher quality has been deemed the greatest factor in student achievement (Rand, 2012; Hightower et al., 2011; Darling-Hammond, 2000). The National Institute of Health posits that lack of reading skills put students at risk for lifetime academic deficits (Fletcher & Lyon, 1998). Additionally, students struggling in academic areas require repeated explicit and strategic exposures over a longer period of time to reach benchmarks (National Center on TIme & Learning).

Action Steps to Implement

Increase teacher quality, by providing professional development opportunities to increase the understanding of brain-based research and number of teachers endorsed or certified in reading instruction.

Person Responsible	Marcy Keeling (keelingm@flaglerschools.com)

Professional development on cultural and socioeconomic sensitivity.

Person Responsible	Marcy Keeling (keelingm@flaglerschools.com)

Provide professional support training for intentionally planned, engaging academic tasks, and regular progress monitoring through collaborative planning and data meetings facilitated by instructional coaches.

| **Person Responsible** | Anna Crawford (crawfordan@flaglerschools.com) |

Creation of common standards-based assessments aligned with rigorous curriculum resources to be used for progress monitoring.

| **Person Responsible** | Teresa Rizzo (rizzot@flaglerschools.com) |

Early identification of academic deficiencies and implementation of evidence-based interventions through MTSS.

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Carroll (carrollj@flaglerschools.com) |

Early identification of academic proficiencies through grade 2 GIFTED screenings.

| **Person Responsible** | Katie Majewski (majewskik@flaglerschools.com) |

Mentoring programs specific for Black/African American students to foster positive relationships to support academic achievement.

| **Person Responsible** | Fred Terry (terryf@flaglerschools.com) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Math performance as measured by the 18-19 FSA in grades 4 and 5 was identified as a schoolwide improvement priority. To ensure that students are receiving standards-based core instruction and targeted interventions strategic planning will occur. Common grade level standards mastery assessments aligned with rigorous curriculum resources will be created. Teachers with the assistance of the instructional coaches will conduct biweekly item analysis of grade level standards mastery and plan for instruction accordingly. Six week intervals of progress monitoring to identify academic deficiencies and proficiencies will ensure that core instruction and targeted interventions are effective.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Wadsworth Elementary School's parents and faculty believe it is our mission to create successful, achieving students. We will accomplish this by working together to understand and use successful learning strategies, both when presenting challenging, yet engaging academic instruction in the classroom, and practicing newly learned material at home.

The administrators of Wadsworth Elementary School, along with the Title 1 Advisory Council, are responsible for the planning, review, and improvement of the school-based Title 1 program. We will invite all parents to join the Title 1 Advisory Council throughout the school year. The Title 1 Advisory Council will meet throughout the year, on the same dates as the Parent-Teacher Organization and the School Advisory Council, to gather input from, and involve, parents in the development of the required plans. Parental input will be documented through meeting minutes, agendas and sign-in sheets. To encourage greater parent participation, Title I Advisory Council meetings will be scheduled to best meet the needs of the parents (SAC & TAC.) Childcare will be provided for families, as well as dinner provided.

Social Media Alerts and home visits can be provided to parents who want to be involved with their child's educational program. We use the School Website to include all school reminders for everything parents might need. We also send home communications to parents in their home language and have interpreters to assist at meetings, so they can be involved.

We host multiple events, including STREAM nights, open houses etc. These are evenings where students can bring in their parent to not only showcase the hard work and success of the learner, but involve their family in the process by giving the student a voice to share the educational process, wherein the learner may deepen their knowledge by teaching it to their parent.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation				$25,897.21
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$2,536.25
			Notes: Aligning Assessment & Instruction 4 days, day one 7 subs, day two 8 subs, day three 9 subs, day four 7 subs AM @ $100.00/day per sub			
	5900	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$7,500.00
			Notes: Goalbook grades K-6			
	5900	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$2,499.00
			Notes: Digital Coach Math 3-6			
	5100	510-Supplies	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$5,826.46
			Notes: STAMS/STAMS Solve Math /STARS(1-6) through Curriculum Associates			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$7,535.50
			Notes: Strategic Planning, 70 staff members @$100/day			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems**				**$113,032.04**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$63,350.50
			Notes: Intervention-serve students in 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th for Tier 3 reading and math support services as well as monitoring EWS data within the LEA			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$4,058.00
			Notes: Progress Monitoring One on One Sessions with rotating sub, 40 days, 1 sub			
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$14,118.00
			Notes: After-school tutoring 4 days 3-6 grade, 2 days K-2, 1 hour, 12teachers@$25/hr-Math & Reading 12 weeks			
	5100	150-Aides	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$31,505.54
			Notes: Paraprofessional- K&1 student support: support classroom instruction and intervention in Kindergarten and 1st Grade with the LEA			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**				**$134,025.35**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$69,144.59
			Notes: Intervention-Tier 3 and ESE:Tier 3 and ESE reading and math support services to students in grade 3 within the LEA			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$64,880.76
			Notes: Intervention-Tier 3 and ESE:Tier 3 and ESE reading and math support services to students in grade 6 within the LEA			

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Literacy and High Expectations				$15,639.20
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$1,688.00
			Notes: Accessing Complex Texts (ACT) 6th grade students books			
	5900	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$270.00
			Notes: Starfall Premium Foundational Skills App for K-2 students			
	5900	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$11,269.75
			Notes: Learning A-Z (RAZ Plus) 61 classrooms K-6			
	5100	510-Supplies	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$2,411.45
			Notes: Reading Strategies @ $401.45 for 11 books, Writing Strategies @ $418.00 for 11 books, Reading & Writing Strategies On Demand PD@ 1592.00 for 8 subscriptions			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Acceleration				$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Enhanced Acceleration				$70,307.68
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0131 - Lewis E. Wadsworth Elementary	Title, I Part A		$70,307.68
			Notes: Math/Science Instructional Coach to serve teachers in grade K-6 within the LEA.			
					Total:	$358,901.48