

School Board of Levy County

Whispering Winds Charter 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	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Whispering Winds Charter School

2481 NW OLD FANNIN RD, Chiefland, FL 32626

<http://www.whisperingwindscharter.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Bartley

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

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	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Whispering Winds Charter School

2481 NW OLD FANNIN RD, Chiefland, FL 32626

<http://www.whisperingwindscharter.com/>

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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	19%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

We provide a public school option for for parents of Pre-K - 5th grade students in Levy, Gilchrist and Dixie Counties. The staff of Whispering Winds Charter School is committed to creating and maintaining an orderly, trusting, and caring environment where teaching and learning are exciting and students are assisted as they develop responsibility. We support a responsibility based, rather than rewards based discipline system. All aspects of the school's organization are designed to accommodate individual learning styles so that all may experience success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our primary vision is to instill a love of and lifelong commitment to learning. Our staff, parents, and students, work collaboratively to ensure all students succeed. Our goal is to provide a quality education where all students attain grade-level or higher performance levels annually, as measured by district and state assessments. Partnerships across the cluster will sustain student success so that all students will read fluently by the end of Grade 2, write proficiently, think critically, and be able to apply learned concepts into skills needed for future job and college ready expectations. Our vision, as a community, is to inspire a passion for learning in a rigorous educational environment utilizing hands-on learning whenever possible. The end result is always to prepare students for college or career readiness utilizing technology and traditional schooling to achieve the skills needed to compete in an increasingly global landscape.

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
Bartley, Kim	Principal	Kim Bartley serves as one of the directors of Whispering Winds Charter School. She is responsible for the daily operation of the school. This includes but is not limited to school and district paperwork, overseeing the personnel of the school, behavior and discipline, parent communication, providing professional development to staff, and student interaction. Conducting instructional staff meetings weekly to discuss school/classroom issues and data. PD is planned or brought to the school by one or both directors based on needs of the teachers or students.
Pittman, Jennifer	Principal	Jennifer Smith-Pittman serves as one of the directors of Whispering Winds Charter School. She is responsible for the daily operation of the school. This includes but is not limited to school and district paperwork, overseeing the personnel of the school, behavior and discipline, parent communication, providing professional development to staff, and student interaction. Conducting instructional staff meetings weekly to discuss school/classroom issues and data. PD is planned or brought to the school by one or both directors based on needs of the teachers or students.

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	21	17	17	21	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/29/2019

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	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	3	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	12	13	12	5	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	3	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	12	13	12	5	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	51%	49%	57%	47%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	59%	58%	59%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	53%	0%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	58%	63%	43%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	80%	64%	62%	41%	52%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	51%	0%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	50%	53%	40%	47%	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	21 (0)	17 (0)	17 (0)	21 (0)	15 (0)	12 (0)	103 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (8)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (8)	0 (3)	0 (0)	0 (7)	0 (1)	0 (19)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (8)	1 (1)	2 (10)

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	67%	52%	15%	58%	9%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	48%	9%	58%	-1%
	2018	27%	41%	-14%	56%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	35%	44%	-9%	56%	-21%
	2018	32%	44%	-12%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	55%	1%	62%	-6%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	59%	12%	64%	7%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	62%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		35%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
05	2019	55%	53%	2%	60%	-5%
	2018	32%	53%	-21%	61%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
	2018	32%	48%	-16%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
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	46			54							

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
WHT	51	78		68	78		50				
FRL	61	82		64	88		40				
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	18	55		25	25						
WHT	28	33		33	50		36				
FRL	35	42		35	52	60	35				
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	31			38							
WHT	43	62		37	43						
FRL	47	50		47	40						

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	309
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	65
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	67
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 that showed the lowest performance was science. 44% of fifth grade students were proficient in science. Contributing factors are minimal time spent on science curriculum and minimal time spent in small group science.

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

The data that showed the greatest (and only) decline from the 2017-2018 school year was science. It declined two percentage points from 46% proficient to 44% proficient. Contributing factors to this are minimal time spent on science curriculum and minimal time spent in science small groups.

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.

Science has the greatest gap compared to state averages. The state average is 46% proficient and our school average is 44%. Contributing factors to this are minimal time spent on science curriculum and minimal time spent in science small groups.

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

ELA learning gains showed the most improvement. There was a 28 percentage point gain. The school strategically placed students in small groups with specific teachers to enhance intervention.

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

Attendance is a potential concern

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

1. Maintaining school grade
2. Improving fifth grade science scores
3. Improving attendance rates for students with chronic absences
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Maintain School Grade

Rationale An area of focus is maintaining our school grade (A). In the 2018-2019 school year we achieved a grade of A by one point. In the 2019-2020 school year we want to maintain our school grade of A and increase the number of points earned for a solid school grade of A.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Whispering Winds plans to maintain and improve the school grade of A. We will move from an A score of 62 to an A score of 64.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kim Bartley (kimberly.bartley@levy.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

Students will be strategically placed in intervention groups based on need. Students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 interventions will receive small group and one-to-one instruction 3 or 5 days a week. Tier 1 students will receive whole group instruction. Students working in small group and one-to-one instruction will focus on the areas of phonics and comprehension strategies. If students are able to fluently read and comprehend they will be better able to read and answer questions on the FSA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

The rationale for selecting this strategy is that students who are in need of additional assistance through tier 2 and tier 3 intervention learn best in small group or one-to-one situations. Student placement will be determined by review of FSA Assessment data and I-ready progress monitoring data.

Action Step

Description

1. Initial testing/ i-Ready Diagnostic and reviewing FSA scores
2. Placement into small groups
3. Progress monitoring every 5/10 days
4. Regroup students after progress monitoring as needed
- 5.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Pittman (jennifer.pittman@levyk12.org)

#2	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	Improving the pass rate for the NGSSS Science Assessment will help ensure that we will improve our school grade score of 62 to 64.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will improve our pass rate from 44% to 50% on the NGSSS Science Assessment in 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Bartley (kimberly.bartley@levy.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will be strategically placed in science intervention groups based on need. Students will focus on basic science skills like The Scientific Method as well as more complex science skills. Students will work in these groups 45minutes a day 4 days a week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Student placement will be determined by review of percentage passed on the previous NGSSS Science Assessment to determine what percentage pass rate to strive for. Intervention groups will be determined by classroom and district science pre-test.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review 18-19 NGSSS Science Assessment 2. Students take District/Classroom science pre-test 3. Students are grouped 4. small groups meet 45 minutes a day, 4 days a week
Person Responsible	Kim Bartley (kimberly.bartley@levy.k12.fl.us)

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).

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.

The school will build positive relationships by maintaining good parent to school relationships. To do this teachers contact each family monthly through phone or in person meetings. The school also holds

multiple functions through out the year to involve families. Whispering Winds reaches out to community members to be involved in all functions.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

Students that are more than one grade level below, will be served in a small group setting that will focus on the needs identified by their first diagnostic, or assessment(s). Students who are a behavior concern are taught about our behavior system and often paired with a peer.

Parents are contacted on a regular basis to discuss the needs of the student.

Students identified by teachers and directors that may have emotional needs may be referred to counseling services through the district school system. Students may also be referred to community resources such as meridian. The teacher/director may provide mentoring to any students in need.

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

We use a cross section of assessments, including, but not limited to i-Ready, Reading Street Unit assessments, as well as formative classroom assessments and daily work, to determine if there are system-wide issues, e.g. if there was a broad base of students not understanding common denominators then we would hypothesize the issue whether it is curriculum and/or instruction. If the data was scattered with no clear focus of weaknesses, the issue is likely more individually related.

Once we determine curriculum/instruction deficiencies or individual weaknesses, we begin a plan to provide support. We monitor the data to determine whether or not the supports are effective. If so, we keep any curriculum/instructional components in place. At the individual level, we provide support until the child is successful. If the child is not successful we continue to provide more support until the child is successful, then gradually remove the supports until the child can be successful independently. We always continue monitoring data to ensure we are providing the supports needed at the school-wide, class-wide and individual levels. The major support to instruction is that every teacher/classroom is provided with a paraprofessional. Added supports for curriculum include supplemental materials such as Orton-Gillingham and Read Well curriculum.

Title I funds are used primarily to fund the salaries for aides. The remaining funds are used to purchase supplemental instructional materials, and parental involvement activities.

At the end of each year an inventory of needs is taken by the administration. Based on these needs is how the supplemental funding is used. We base our decision on data from the year. For example if a program did not improve scores to a certain percentage then we may choose to not purchase again. All resources funded through one of the above programs is inventoried and kept.

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.

School directors take inventory of all materials, technology, and curriculum each year to address what needs to be updated or replenished. Funds from federal programs such as Title 1 are used to update or restore these depleted resources. These resources are used in the classroom and in small group

intervention to maximize student outcomes. Directors and teachers meet to determine what needs are other than what is noted on the inventory throughout the year. These meetings take place monthly and the directors (Kim Bartley and Jennifer Pittman) are responsible for holding them. Data is taken on students using specific curriculum, materials, and interventions purchased with this money to determine its impact on student outcomes.

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

The school helps students learn about various college and career paths. Multiple community members are invited to speak with students through out the year and provide information on different careers. The school's SRO/Sheriff's Department provides information to students on different law enforcement careers through out the school year. The Chiefland fire department provides students with a demonstration of using specific fire equipment and how to become a firefighter/EMT. City election staff provide information and demonstrations on careers with the city. Whispering winds board of directors speaks with students about the importance of continuing education. Whispering Winds works closely with the local 4-H chapter to provide information on careers in agriculture and maintains its own club.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Maintain School Grade	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00