

Orange County Public Schools

Wedgefield School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	16

Wedgefield School

3835 BANCROFT BLVD, Orlando, FL 32833

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>45%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>43%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <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.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Stevens, Natalie	Principal
Soubasis, Steven	Assistant Principal
Gefter, Audra	Guidance Counselor
Blackwell, Robin	Teacher, ESE
Silpe, Shane	Dean
Springer, Deborah	Guidance Counselor
Farrow, Deadra	Instructional Coach
Drinkwater, Emily	Instructional Coach

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Our school leadership team meets weekly to share important events and activities going on within the school day that affects each student. We reflect on academics, mental health, discipline, students needs, MTSS process, and how we can each serve to support the needs of our students.

Mrs. Stevens (Principal) and Mr. Soubasis (AP) are responsible for coaching and observing teachers, being a part of leading PLC's, PD's and staff meetings, encouraging and recognizing students achievements in academics, and behavior, and leading the work in data throughout the school.

Mrs. Drinkwater & Ms. Farrow (Instructional Coaches) will be in charge of helping teachers as a coach and helping lead their instruction to a high achievement level. They will work with a new teacher program to support our new teachers to help retain them as great teachers for many years to come. They will be working with student intervention groups, working in PLC's, PD's, staff meetings, and data meetings.

Ms. Gefter and Mrs. Springer (Guidance Counselors) will support all students academic,

emotional, and life needs. They will teach character education, child safety matters, college and career readiness, and support behavior interventions.

Mrs. Blackwell (Staffing Specialist) will take care of our students with an IEP, 504, Gifted, ESE, and ESOL. She will support the MTSS process and help students get all the support they may need. Mrs. Blackwell will work closely with all teachers, and leadership to convey students who may have specific needs because of the MTSS process, or in their specific staffing placements.

Mr. Silpe (Administrative Dean) will be working in PLC's, PD's, staff meetings, and data meetings to share not only discipline data, but to support teachers and their needs of students both academically, and their behaviors. He will help coach teachers who need support with classroom management, and he will support the MTSS Tier 1 & 2 behaviors.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	18	8	12	19	11	12	21	17	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	2	11	8	10	6	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	11	2	10	16	9	11	13	18	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	24	24	29	18	24	0	0	0	0	135

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	1	4	2	9	13	11	11	16	12	0	0	0	0	79

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	5	4	0	0	0	0	26

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 7/25/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	16	10	16	12	5	8	15	10	7	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	6	4	5	2	5	2	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	4	7	16	10	6	16	34	25	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	16	27	14	23	15	0	0	0	0	105

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators		2	1	3	8	9	8	14	18	12	0	0	0	75

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	16	10	16	12	5	8	15	10	7	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	6	4	5	2	5	2	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	4	7	16	10	6	16	34	25	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	16	27	14	23	15	0	0	0	0	105

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators		2	1	3	8	9	8	14	18	12	0	0	0	75

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA lowest 25% was our lowest performing data component at 48%. This is not a trend as this is only the second year of data for our school, and previously our lowest category was Math lowest 25% at 34% in 2017.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Wedgefield School had 2 data components decline 2% from the previous year. The 2 data components are Science achievement which went from 53% to 51%, and our math achievement went from 66% to 64%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Science achievement had the largest gap at 6%. The state performed at 57%, and our school was at 51%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component showing the most improvement was Math lowest 25% gaining 16% from the previous year. Last year we had 34% as a school, and this year we moved to 50%.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

As a school we focused on our bottom quartile in both math and ELA. We used data from the I-ready program to assist in instructional decision making. Our school offered ELA tutoring after school on Tuesdays and Thursdays from November to March. Math tutoring was offered two Saturdays a month from November to March. Students who were close to making learning gains were identified and progress monitored following the mid year I-ready diagnostic.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	65%	60%	60%	0%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	57%	57%	0%	61%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	54%	52%	0%	54%	49%
Math Achievement	64%	60%	61%	0%	62%	56%
Math Learning Gains	58%	60%	58%	0%	59%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	55%	52%	0%	47%	48%
Science Achievement	51%	56%	57%	0%	58%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	74%	77%	0%	82%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (16)	18 (10)	8 (16)	12 (12)	19 (5)	11 (8)	12 (15)	21 (10)	17 (7)	131 (99)
One or more suspensions	0 (6)	1 (4)	1 (5)	2 (2)	2 (5)	11 (2)	8 (6)	10 (5)	6 (8)	41 (43)
Course failure in ELA or Math	6 (7)	11 (4)	2 (7)	10 (16)	16 (10)	9 (6)	11 (16)	13 (34)	18 (25)	96 (125)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	16 (10)	24 (16)	24 (27)	29 (14)	18 (23)	24 (15)	135 (105)

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	2018	74%	55%	19%	57%	17%
	2017	81%	57%	24%	58%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
	2017	62%	57%	5%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2018	61%	55%	6%	55%	6%
	2017	63%	51%	12%	53%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2018	59%	48%	11%	52%	7%
	2017	66%	52%	14%	52%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
07	2018	63%	48%	15%	51%	12%
	2017	66%	52%	14%	52%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2018	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%
	2017	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	72%	61%	11%	62%	10%
	2017	77%	63%	14%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
	2017	67%	64%	3%	64%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2018	59%	59%	0%	61%	-2%
	2017	56%	56%	0%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2018	25%	35%	-10%	52%	-27%
	2017	38%	43%	-5%	51%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
07	2018	71%	51%	20%	54%	17%
	2017	58%	52%	6%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		33%				
08	2018	50%	32%	18%	45%	5%
	2017	51%	30%	21%	46%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	47%	49%	-2%	50%	-3%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		47%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	74%	66%	8%	71%	3%
2017	74%	67%	7%	69%	5%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	84%	61%	23%	62%	22%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2017	85%	53%	32%	60%	25%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	79%	65%	14%	56%	23%
2017	82%	43%	39%	53%	29%
Compare		-3%			

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	39	43	29	55	50	23	43	36		
ELL	32	53	60	29	53	60					
ASN	64	64		64	64						
BLK	65	50	67	66	54	53	50	91	88		
HSP	59	57	50	53	58	51	42	71	59		
MUL	47	50		60	50						
WHT	68	57	44	68	60	49	57	75	76		
FRL	54	51	43	56	57	51	40	67	74		
2017 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	24	38	38	32	36	34	6	53			
ELL	41	47	55	41	26						
ASN	77	58		92	83						
BLK	65	57	50	63	50	39	50	100	70		
HSP	61	65	62	52	38	28	34	68	71		
WHT	68	52	30	72	51	35	59	72	90		
FRL	57	52	40	55	40	27	42	57	77		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Increase ELA, Math, and Science proficiency in all subgroups by 3%. (Division Priority: Accelerate Student Performance)
Rationale	In our Culturally Responsive School Plan we have noticed achievement gaps within our school. We want to make sure that students who are performing well, continue to perform well in all areas, and all students make gains.
Intended Outcome	We would like to see a 3% gain in each of the subgroups. We will monitor this data by looking at our school data and meeting with our Culturally Responsive School Plan team monthly. Our team will target attendance data, discipline data, and achievement data. We will provide staff with resources so that they are aware of implicit biases and can address them. We will provide support strategies for students who are not performing at proficient levels, as well as those who are performing at advanced levels. Our school will use I-ready and MTSS data to help us support students and their needs.
Point Person	Steven Soubasis (steven.soubasis@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Staff PD and presentations at staff meetings.2. PLC data chats bi-monthly.3. Each teacher will meet monthly to go over their MTSS data and receive instructional coaching4. MTSS team will meet to address individual students.5. Implementation of Science Daily thinking activities and interactive notebooks.
Person Responsible	Steven Soubasis (steven.soubasis@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	We plan to monitor this data quarterly as students take I-ready assessments. Improvement will be evident when analyzing subgroup data following each administration. If gains are not being made, individual teacher meetings with administration will be conducted to develop a plan for student improvement.
Person Responsible	Steven Soubasis (steven.soubasis@ocps.net)

Activity #2

Title Increase ELA and Math learning gains in the lowest 25% by 3%. (Division priority: Narrow Achievement Gaps).

Rationale 48% of our ELA students, and 50% of our Math students in the lowest 25% have made learning gains in 2017-2018. This is an improvement from the 2016-2017 school year.

Intended Outcome We would like to increase 3% in both math lowest 25% and ELA lowest 25%. We will use our frequent MTSS meetings, and bi-monthly PLC's to analyze data and discuss interventions.

Point Person Natalie Stevens (natalie.stevens@ocps.net)

Action Step

Description

1. Bi-Monthly PLC's to analyze data and create intervention groups.
2. Coaches and administration will monitor intervention groups during classroom coaching observations.
3. The instructional coach will meet with individual teachers to plan support for tier 2 &3 instruction.
4. Through classroom observations continue to support teachers who may have needed time to implement feedback, and conduct new coaching observations to see the small groups and interventions working.

Person Responsible Natalie Stevens (natalie.stevens@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Coaches and administration will meet with collaborative teams and on an individual level to interpret data growth and collect teacher feedback on instructional interventions. Teacher effectiveness will be monitored through the iobservation tool.

Person Responsible Natalie Stevens (natalie.stevens@ocps.net)

Activity #3

Title

Increase ELA gains for all students by 3% through the work of the DPLC.
(Division Priority: Accelerate Student Performance)

Rationale

Our district has set up a three year plan to address improving all students reading strategies and their achievement level through the work of the DPLC. We want to continue to focus on using the strategies of close reading, and develop our writing strategies this year as well.

Intended Outcome

In 2017-2018 school year 56% of our students made learning gains in ELA as a school. In 2018-2019 school year we would like to see an increase of 3% to 59% of our students with ELA learning gains. Our DPLC group will provide PD for teachers to enrich strategies for close reading and writing skills for our students.

Point Person

Natalie Stevens (natalie.stevens@ocps.net)

Action Step**Description**

1. DBQ training for 4th, 5th, middle school ELA, and social studies teachers.
2. DPLC representatives will participate in district DPLC trainings.
3. DPLC team will conduct PD to our instructional staff on reading and writing strategies to support their students.
4. Through classroom observations continue to support teachers and conduct observations looking for evidence of the new strategies being implemented.

Person Responsible

Natalie Stevens (natalie.stevens@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**Description**

DPLC team will meet with their departments to get feedback from teachers of the implementation. Administration will meet with the DPLC team to find how we can support the teachers to continue to implement the new strategies at a high level. Administration will do classroom walkthroughs to see the strategies being used.

Person Responsible

Natalie Stevens (natalie.stevens@ocps.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Since the inception of Wedgefield School, the community has played an active role in creating an engaging learning environment for their children. School leadership has met with parents and the community to keep them connected with the school's building progression, the school's opening, and now the multitude of opportunities that parents and

the community have to become involved in their children's education. Wedgefield leadership, teachers, and staff communicate with families in a variety of ways. To keep parents apprised of school activities, important dates, current updates, and information, we utilize our school website, the OCPS Connect Orange, the Wedgefield School Facebook page and the marquee at the entrance of the school. In addition to the OCPS Progress Reports and Report Cards, parents are kept informed of their child's progress through ProgressBook, phone calls and emails, notes in planners, Canvas learning platform, and parent/teacher conferences. In addition, our school and district mission is posted in the front office so parents see them upon entering the school.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

At Wedgefield School, we understand the importance of providing students with the tools and skills necessary to become responsive and caring adults. We understand that to meet the needs of our students and families, we must provide careful and systematic attention to students' social and emotional learning. In an effort to identify students in need in the fastest way possible, our school psychologist will play an integral role in our MTSS process. Identified students will receive individual and/or group counseling as they are identified. Our school Guidance Counselors will also coordinate support groups for anger management, peer conflicts (using Restorative Justice training), social skills, divorce, grief and loss. We also work closely with Aspire counselors who come to the school to provide individual counseling to help meet a variety of needs of our students. Other information that supports a better understanding of students has been gathered through the Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) assessment. The BPIE has 34 indicators which helps schools focus on planning, MTSS and communication. We have also purchased the Second Step program to use during Health lessons to meet the needs of the K-5 social emotional growth. Sheryl Posey, school psychologist, has partnered with our school to provide training and support throughout the year.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Wedgefield School is one of the select schools to participate in the K-8 model, offering a seamless transition from elementary to middle grades. Wedgefield School extends its learning further by offering two half day Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten classes to four-year-olds in the community.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Monthly MTSS Meetings will be conducted in grades K-8 to review and discuss student performance within Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention support levels. PLC Meetings will be focused on building cohesive teams that provide consistent standards-based instruction.

Data will be analyzed for trends and decisions will be made by the team to address those areas of concern by implementing quality Tier 2 interventions. Tier 3 interventions will be developed by the MTSS Team to target specific student needs.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Wedgefield School will continue to advance college and career awareness through a multitude of programs like Naviance, Teach-In, College Wednesday's , Agriscience, ICTS, DIT and Project Lead the Way (PLTW). College days will be used to increase K-8 student awareness and attentiveness of college and university programs. Naviance will be used specifically with the middle school students to build their knowledge of potential careers making connections to local and national college and universities. Through a partnership with Valencia Community college, underperforming 8th grade students will be able to tour a college campus and hear about opportunities through their counselors'. Lockheed Martin and Voya financial are making connections through PLTW courses and Teach-In as well. Through our Teach-In program community members and business partners will be invited to share their occupations with students from Pre-K - 8th grade.

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$14,200.00
---------------	--------------------