

St. Lucie Public Schools

Windmill Point Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Windmill Point Elementary School

700 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/wmp>

Demographics

Principal: Brie Lamb

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 St. Lucie 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Windmill Point Elementary School

700 SW DARWIN BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34953

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/wmp>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	74%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Lucie 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.

Windmill Point Elementary promises to nurture a positive school culture and to ensure academic excellence by preparing students for college and career readiness through the fostering of self-confidence, instillation of responsibility, and development of leadership skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Upon entering Windmill Point Elementary, you are met with a warm and inviting environment. When you enter our school, you are welcomed by faculty and staff members. As you walk the halls, you hear the chatter of children excitedly discussing the day's assignments. Glancing around, you notice authentic work that students have chosen to display. It is apparent that students feel secure and comfortable at Windmill Point.

As you continue through Windmill Point, you observe that everyone in the school believes it is important to discover what motivates children. Administration, faculty, and staff work collaboratively to design engaging work for students. Teachers are guided by their grade level scope and sequence and have a clear understanding of what students should know and be able to do. They use data from a variety of assessments, including engagement surveys, to guide instruction for each individual child. Faculty and staff strive to meet high expectations. They are lifelong learners and model this behavior for students. Teachers eagerly implement innovative ideas in their classroom and often share results with colleagues, parents, and community members.

Continuing your journey through our school, you see evidence of parent and community involvement. At Windmill Point Elementary, these citizens serve as partners in educating children. The community volunteers are valuable resources that are utilized to provide rich and authentic learning experiences for children. Administrators, teachers, and staff create opportunities for parental and community involvement to promote student achievement. All of the Windmill Point family is involved in the school decision making process, focusing on every aspect of the child's education.

Windmill Point Elementary is a unique school where everyone works together and supports one another. The ultimate goal is the continuous improvement of students, teachers, staff, and community partners as an integral part of our students' education.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lamb, Brie	Principal	
Nigro, Kelly	Assistant Principal	
Reals, Leah	Teacher, ESE	
Ackenbrack, Cara-Ann	Instructional Coach	
Time, Marjorie	School Counselor	
Roundtree, Shannon	School Counselor	
Knab, Heather	Instructional Coach	
Pizzarello, Janie	Instructional Coach	

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	126	145	140	157	142	164	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	874
Attendance below 90 percent	9	17	15	17	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	28	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

54

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/16/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	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	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	29	24	11	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	5	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	5	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	19	26	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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	7	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	49%	50%	57%	56%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	58%	55%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	53%	42%	56%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	53%	63%	67%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	50%	62%	66%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	42%	51%	62%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	46%	53%	39%	44%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	126 (0)	145 (0)	140 (0)	157 (0)	142 (0)	164 (0)	874 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (0)	17 (0)	15 (0)	17 (0)	9 (0)	14 (0)	81 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	8 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (0)	28 (0)	56 (0)	98 (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.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	50%	-1%	58%	-9%
	2018	48%	46%	2%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	51%	-6%	58%	-13%
	2018	49%	50%	-1%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	55%	18%	62%	11%
	2018	55%	54%	1%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	54%	-3%	64%	-13%
	2018	41%	57%	-16%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	34%	47%	-13%	60%	-26%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	46%	-7%	53%	-14%
	2018	50%	50%	0%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	48	53	24	48	55	21				
ELL	33	43	62	53	55	60	22				
BLK	47	52	46	46	46	52	30				
HSP	45	46	58	56	51	40	38				
MUL	52	47		54	50						
WHT	51	55	65	54	52	46	50				
FRL	47	52	59	52	48	44	36				
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	16	48	47	21	23	13	36				
ELL	28	50	67	40	44	40					
ASN	73			82							
BLK	43	51	71	35	23	14	32				
HSP	46	47	46	53	47	42	58				
MUL	56	31		56	38						
WHT	55	55	59	54	35	30	64				
FRL	46	46	54	46	35	27	48				
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	18	27	23	27	45	41	7				
ELL	30	39	33	49	53	60	4				
BLK	47	54	43	56	60	44	26				
HSP	57	56	43	69	68	80	37				
MUL	67	53		76	73						
WHT	56	54	43	71	67	69	54				

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
FRL	53	52	42	65	65	63	36				

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	53
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	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	51
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The data component the showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement. The contributing factor to the low performance was the cohort of students lacked ELA proficiency in 2016-17 (60% proficient), 2017-18 (49% proficient), and 2018-19 (46% proficiency).

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

The data component the showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement. The contributing factor to the low performance was the cohort of students lacked ELA proficiency in 2016-17 (60% proficient), 2017-18 (49% proficient), and 2018-19 (46% proficiency).

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.

The data component the showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement. The contributing factor to the low performance was the cohort of students lacked ELA proficiency in 2016-17 (60% proficient), 2017-18 (49% proficient), and 2018-19 (46% proficiency).

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is Math bottom 25%, with an increase of 19%. The new actions our school took this year that attributed to this improvement was departmentalizing grades 3,4,5, math club, additional differentiated instruction, and building capacity through district PD (boot camp).

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

After reflecting on the EWS data, an area of concern is the number of students with a level 1 on state FSA assessment.

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

1. Increase Science proficiency
2. Increase Learning Gains in ELA
3. Increase Learning Gains in Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Learning Gains in ELA
Rationale	ELA Learning Gains is below the district and state percentages over the past two years.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, students will increase Learning Gains rate by 12% earning 63% gains on ELA Learning Gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning) to create standards based instruction, review data/quality of instruction, and create differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with teachers, create common lesson plans that are standards based, and to close learning gaps based on data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common grade level CLP times facilitated by academic coaches with ESE support teachers included. 2. Additional CLP time on early release days. 3. Weekly Quality Instruction time to review unit assessment data, iReady data, common assessment data, and next steps. 4. Professional development on Daily 5 and Differentiated Instruction 5. Classroom walkthroughs
Person Responsible	Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

#2	
Title	Science
Rationale	Science proficiency decline last year by 12%, lower than both district and state proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, students will increase proficiency rate by 14% earning 54% proficiency on Science achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning) to create standards based instruction, review data/quality of instruction, and create differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with teachers, create common lesson plans that are standards based, and to close learning gaps based on data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common grade level CLP times facilitated by academic coaches with ESE support teachers included. 2. Bi-monthly CLP with district support (Beth Bonvie) 2. Additional CLP time on early release days. 3. Weekly Quality Instruction time to review unit assessment data, common assessment data, and next steps. 5. Classroom walkthroughs
Person Responsible	Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

#3	
Title	Learning Gains in Math
Rationale	While students did have an increase in Math Learning Gains, they are at the same percent as district average and below the state average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, students will increase Learning Gains rate by 12% earning 62% gains on Math Learning Gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy to be implemented is CLP (Collaborative Learning and Planning) to create rigorous standards based instruction, review data/quality of instruction, and create differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is to build capacity with teachers, create common lesson plans that are standards based meeting the intent and rigor of the standard, and to close learning gaps and/or build foundational skills based on data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common grade level CLP times facilitated by academic coaches with ESE support teachers included. 2. Additional CLP time on early release days. 3. Additional support from district level academic coach (Chris Worley) 4. Weekly Quality Instruction time to review unit assessment data, iReady data, common assessment data, and next steps. 5. Classroom walkthroughs
Person Responsible	Brie Lamb (brie.lamb@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

N/A

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

I. Engage Title I as Partners in Planning

Involve Title I parents in jointly developing, implementing, and revising the Family and Community Engagement Policy and the District Title I Family Involvement Plan.

- a. Provide informational workshops to Title 1 Parents throughout the year on the Family and Community Engagement Policy and Plan
- b. Annually assess the implementation of the Family and Community Engagement Policy and Plan with the input of Title 1 families
- c. Provide opportunities throughout the year for Title I families to participate in the dialogue and decision making to Title I school programs.
- d. Develop partnerships with community based organizations

II Expand and Support Effective Strategies to Involve Parents

- a. Provide a menu of workshops that provide families with information on how to improve student achievement
- b. Make information available such as the St. Lucie County Parent Resource Center, to Title I parents through the school website
- c. Develop and use effective communication methods to ensure all Title I families, regardless of income, ethnic background, or language share and receive school to home, and home to school communications about district and school level programs and activities. (postcards, brochures, email)
- d. Provide reasonable supports and resources associated with parent involvement activities as requested by Title I parents.

III Build Capacity of Parent, Educators, and Community to Help School Achievement

- a. Offer workshops twice a year to Title I parents on understanding academic standards and assessments
- b. Offer workshops to Title I parents and community members

IV. Coordinate and Integrate Strategies with Other Groups that Support Parent Involvement

- c. Resources for Title I parents on options for Early Learning
- d. Develop appropriate roles for community based organizations and businesses in parental involvement activities, recruit partners and volunteers to support Title I parent involvement efforts

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.

Our school provides various social skills and counseling services to students as the need arises. The guidance counselor at our school coordinates these services and provides counseling for students. Our school has a High Hopes group for students who are struggling through the divorce of a parent. There are also Big Brothers Big Sisters mentors who come on campus through an agency, matched to mentor students. Many outside counseling agencies are provided a location on campus to provide services during the school day. In addition to providing counseling and social skills when needed, the guidance counselor also works with parents to identify available services for students and families in need.

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

The district provides pre-school services for primary readiness through the Voluntary Pre-K program which employs teachers who are proficient in individualizing the curriculum and creating the kind of quality environment that move children toward kindergarten, ready to learn. The Standards for Four-Year Olds are aligned with the kindergarten Florida Standards. The standards are organized in five domains:

Physical Development

Approaches to Learning

Social and Emotional Development

Language, Communication, and Emergent Literacy

Cognitive Development and General Knowledge

Each VPK classroom also receives oral language/vocabulary, literacy and classroom management support from a team of highly qualified professionals.

As a school, we assist with transition by providing tours for families along with kindergarten orientation opportunities.

For our outgoing fifth grade students with disabilities, transition meetings are held between WMP and the receiving school.

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.

The leadership team meets weekly to review schedules and the allotment of resources across the school to ensure that the school's SIP goals are being addressed and the appropriate necessary resources are being used. For instruction, planning, and MTSS, all personnel are used to ensure services provided are meeting the needs of students. The allotment of financial resources is determined in partnership with the district. Our school administrative team determined there was a significant need for an instructional coach and an MTSS/Writing coach. With the help of the district Title I department, we were able to identify funds to obtain these personnel resources. Additionally, the leadership team determined the need to provide teachers full days and half days to analyze data and collaboratively plan for instruction. It was also determined that extensive professional development is needed to assist teachers with our SIP goal, delivery of standards-based instruction, analyzing and tracking data, providing feedback and implementing the focused, data-driven model.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains in ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains in Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00