

School Board of Levy County

Williston Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Williston Elementary School

801 S MAIN ST, Williston, FL 32696

<http://www.levy12.org/schools>

Demographics

Principal: Jamie Handlin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School 3-5 |
| 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) | 90% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | <p>Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students</p> |
| School Grades History | <p>2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (47%)</p> |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Dustin Sims |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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

Our mission is to provide a safe and enriching environment, preparing all students for college and career readiness through quality instruction and collaboration with all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement

Small town, big dreams!

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Hart, Ashley | Instructional Coach | Provide professional development for the whole school in reading instruction. This would involve whole group professional development, small group professional development, and modeling in the classroom for teachers. She often coteaches with teachers to help facilitate highly effective instructional strategies and effective classroom management. In addition, she is part of the AVID instructional team and attends professional learning for herself in which she brings back for our staff. |
| Handlin, Jaime | Principal | The primary responsibilities of the principal is the safety and security of the students in the school. She manages the everyday functions of the school and makes all instructional decisions for the school. She is in charge of all recruitment and retention of staff, evaluations and professional learning. In addition, she handles the budgeting of materials and supplies to run the school and to support instruction, including Title One. |
| Hancock, Emily | Assistant Principal | The primary responsibilities of the assistant principal is the safety and security of the students in the school. She supports the principal in managing the everyday functions of the school and supports all instructional decisions for the school. She supports all recruitment and retention of staff, evaluations and professional learning. In addition, she supports the budgeting of materials and supplies to run the school and to support instruction, including Title One. Finally, she oversees discipline for the student body. |
| Spofforth, Gemma | Guidance Counselor | The job duty and responsibility of the guidance counselor is to oversee the ESOL program, 504 plans in the school, and support the IEP plans and implementation. She also oversee the PBiS initiative and organizes events for students for positive behavior and career days. She provides small group and individual counseling with students, supporting their social/emotional needs. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Jamie Handlin

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.*

2

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School 3-5 |
| 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) | 90% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (47%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Dustin Sims |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |

* 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 175 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 453 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 34 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 34 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |

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 | 84 | 97 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/4/2020

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 149 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 499 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 68 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 |

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 | 111 | 115 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 347 |

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 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 149 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 499 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 68 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 |

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 | 111 | 115 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 347 |

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 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 54% | 49% | 57% | 51% | 43% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 51% | 59% | 58% | 48% | 44% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | 55% | 53% | 39% | 44% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 68% | 58% | 63% | 63% | 52% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 66% | 64% | 62% | 60% | 47% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 42% | 51% | 35% | 40% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 62% | 50% | 53% | 58% | 46% | 55% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
| | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (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% | 52% | 11% | 58% | 5% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 48% | 5% | 57% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 47% | 48% | -1% | 58% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 41% | 7% | 56% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 48% | 44% | 4% | 56% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 44% | 8% | 55% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 69% | 55% | 14% | 62% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 55% | 0% | 62% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 62% | 59% | 3% | 64% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 59% | 12% | 62% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 68% | 53% | 15% | 60% | 8% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 53% | 10% | 61% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 60% | 49% | 11% | 53% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 48% | 10% | 55% | 3% |
| 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 | 19 | 38 | 41 | 29 | 39 | 34 | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 46 | 21 | 69 | 74 | 50 | 48 | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 46 | 40 | 23 | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 57 | | 70 | 70 | | 55 | | | | |
| MUL | 47 | 50 | | 53 | 43 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 55 | 58 | 77 | 72 | 40 | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 49 | 53 | 61 | 62 | 44 | 53 | | | | |

| 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 | 18 | 32 | 29 | 23 | 34 | 19 | 23 | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 58 | 57 | 62 | 64 | 73 | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 33 | 30 | 35 | 36 | 17 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 63 | 67 | 65 | 61 | | 62 | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | | | 56 | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 57 | 50 | 38 | 72 | 69 | 41 | 66 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 44 | 38 | 58 | 56 | 35 | 51 | | | | |

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 | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 56 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 448 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

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

English Language Learners

| | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 51 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Black/African American Students

| | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 36 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 62 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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

Students with Disabilities and Black sub groups in ELA and Math are below the 41% and decreased in the 2018-2019 school year in reading and math. Contributing factors

include a need for more differentiated support in small group, as well as the need for parent and student involvement in school events. There has been a continuing trend that these two subgroups have been low performing for our school over the last several years.

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

Fourth grade Math declined from 71% to 62% for the 2019 FSA. This decline was still evident in our progress monitoring data used during the 2020-2021 school year. Looking at our subgroup population, the learning gains in ELA in our Hispanic population showed a 6% decline. Contributing factors for this decline include an influx of Hispanic students entering from other countries with little to no language acquisition. Progress monitoring data used in the 2020-2021 school year showed this is still a concern.

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

Overall, the largest gap in the 2019 FSA data was in Math lowest quartile, 9% below state average, and in ELA learning gains, our lowest quartile was 7% below state average. The factors that contributed to this gap is the decline in academic achievement seen in our ESE and black subgroup, as they are also the bottom quartile. Specialized and purposeful small group instruction will be implemented to close the gap will help to increase learning gains for the bottom quartile.

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

The ELA lowest quartile is up 10% from 2018-2019, and Math lowest quartile is up 7% from 2018-2019. Our school made this sub group a focus for our teachers, collaborating and differentiating lesson plans to meet the needs of these lowest quartile students. This work continued into the 2019-2020 school year.

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

While our students with two or more indicators have decreased in each grade level, there are still more than 50% of students in each grade level with EWS indicators. Minority students are overrepresented in the EWS data.

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

1. SWD ELA achievement and learning gains
2. SWD Math achievement and learning gains
3. Black ELA achievement and learning gains
4. Black Math achievement and learning gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The area of focus was chosen because we have not seen significant gains in ELA proficiency and learning gains in 4th and 5th grade. This continues to be an area of focus. Overall ELA proficiency was 54% as measured by the 2019 FSA with 4th grade declining by 1% and 5th declining by 4%. ELA learning gains increased by 3% to 51%, but remains an area of focus. Special attention will continue for our SWD and Black subgroups for action plans and monitoring due to those subgroups being below 41% on the federal index for ESSA. With the school closures that occurred in the 2019-2020 school year, the academic progress in for ELA was stymied and will remain at the forefront for the 2020-2021 school year.

Measureable Outcome:

In the 2020-2021 school year, Williston Elementary school will increase ELA proficiency 10% as measured by the FSA. As proficiency will be measured from 3rd to 5th grade students we are seeking to increase or maintain learning gains from the 2019 to 2021 school years.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaime Handlin (jaime.handlin@levyk12.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Williston Elementary will begin our 3rd year as an AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) school. All classroom teachers have been trained on AVID strategies and will implement them in their classrooms; W (writing), I (Inquiry), C (collaboration), O (organization), R (reading). Teachers will include these strategies in their lesson plans. Williston Elementary will build on our culture of growth mindset to ensure students are college and career ready. Students and teachers jointly identify areas in need of improvement and establish achievable goals for students. In addition, we will identify model classrooms for teachers to demonstrate the use of integrated AVID strategies. Our main goal in implementation this year is to increase student engagement in lessons and activities which is aligned with an area of improvement for SACS accreditation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

AVID is a program that in Florida has impacted more than 2 million students by providing academic and social support to ensure student success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Summer Institute - a selected group of teachers and school leaders attended 2020 AVID XP summer institute in preparation of the upcoming year.
2. School-wide implementation - the AVID program and its strategies will be implemented school-wide; WICOR
3. School-wide PD - The teachers and school leaders that went to AVID XP will lead school-wide professional development.
4. Planning days- During these days teachers will collaboratively plan differentiated small group instruction.
5. Use of CANVAS platform to provide CORE instruction digitally and to differentiate student work.
6. Diagnostic and formative assessments- Students will take a diagnostic and formative to

get an accurate representation of their current ELA level which will result in an adjustment in instruction.

Person Responsible Ashley Hart (ashley.hart@levyk12.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

WES leadership team will also work to improve math achievement and growth in the lowest quartile. This work will be conducted simultaneously with the ELA improvement work. Action steps taken to improve ELA will be mirrored in math coursework as well. Math instruction will include AVID strategies, specific vocabulary instruction, purposeful planning during collaborative planning and tutoring options for SWD and Black subgroups. Diagnostic and formative assessments will be used to guide and adjust instruction. This year, CANVAS will be implemented for online learning options for blended students as well as as differentiation options for traditional students.

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.

Williston Elementary School strives to build relationships with our students by recognizing and understanding the importance of our student's diverse cultures. WES begins the year by hosting a "Meet the Teacher/Open House" event, and holds the first teacher parent conference night the following month. Forming and building parent partnerships and reviewing student progress is an integral part of the parent conferences.

Throughout the year WES will host two Family Activity Nights with each having a different area of focus (STEAM, Black History, Florida History/Local Government). WES will also have a fall festival where staff members along with different community members will set up booths for the students and their families to participate in fun activities. Parent communication also occurs through the Remind system, phone calls home, Skyward, newsletters, Facebook, and parent conference nights held twice a year. Parents and community members also have an opportunity to participate in making school

based decisions through the SAC meetings held each month. During SAC meetings parents are presented with current school data in order to assist in the problem solving cycle. In addition to parent input, the community is invited to participate in the Open House, community forums, and informal opportunities such as judging student speech contests.

WES is a positive behavior school, we have a school-wide multiple level behavior management system in place. Behavior data is gathered and analyzed monthly during PST meetings by the school's problem solving team. Classroom teacher behavior management clip charts; recognizing wanted and unwanted behaviors and utilizing rewards and consequences that correlate with the behaviors. Complement Coins that are rewarded to classes in common areas such as; lunchroom, library, Special Areas, sidewalks, computer labs. 10 Complement Coins earns a class reward. Positive referrals earned by students who show exemplary citizenship. Teachers also make positive phone calls home when students are exhibiting exceptional behaviors, which are documented on teachers class call logs. Students are encouraged to assist in creating classroom rules as well as volunteer options for their positive choice rewards.

Staff plays an integral part at WES. All staff are celebrated for their accomplishments and are invited to participate in leadership roles on identified committees. The staff is surveyed for their professional development needs in addition to their interpretation of the current climate and culture. These anonymous surveys are used to make adjustments in the professional development plan as well as strengthen current practices and respond to concerns.

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: ELA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Total: \$0.00 |