

Polk County Public Schools

Wendell Watson 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	18

Wendell Watson Elementary School

6800 WALT WILLIAMS RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/wwe>

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Burgess

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2016

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)	84%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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	18

Wendell Watson Elementary School

6800 WALT WILLIAMS RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/wwe>

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	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Wendell Watson Elementary school in partnership with family and community will provide rigorous instruction for ALL students as we prepare them for a successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will become life longlearners through rigorous learning experiences at Wendell Watson Elementary.

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
Burgess, Kelly	Principal	
Poe-Liburd, Tanya	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Deann	Teacher, K-12	
Richard, Shari	Instructional Coach	
Oglesby, Melanie	Instructional Coach	
Williamson, Mallory	Teacher, K-12	
Holmes, Kathryn	Teacher, K-12	
Long, Megan	Instructional Coach	
Martin, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	
Neely, Shamiya	Teacher, K-12	
Miller, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	

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	129	139	124	127	130	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	804
Attendance below 90 percent	20	19	19	17	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	3	11	3	3	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	5	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	41	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	1	3	1	6	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	4	9	19	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/15/2019

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	30	23	21	14	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

One or more suspensions	2	1	0	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Course failure in ELA or Math	7	4	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
-------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	4	4	1	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	30	23	21	14	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

One or more suspensions	2	1	0	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Course failure in ELA or Math	7	4	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
-------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	4	4	1	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	51%	57%	64%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	51%	58%	58%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	49%	53%	52%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	58%	57%	63%	67%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	56%	62%	49%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	47%	51%	34%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	47%	53%	58%	46%	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	129 (0)	139 (0)	124 (0)	127 (0)	130 (0)	155 (0)	804 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	20 (30)	19 (23)	19 (21)	17 (14)	13 (25)	17 (17)	105 (130)
One or more suspensions	3 (2)	11 (1)	3 (0)	3 (5)	4 (3)	12 (2)	36 (13)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (7)	2 (4)	5 (0)	3 (13)	2 (0)	5 (0)	17 (24)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	34 (35)	41 (20)	28 (22)	103 (77)

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	59%	52%	7%	58%	1%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	48%	3%	58%	-7%
	2018	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	60%	47%	13%	56%	4%
	2018	56%	50%	6%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	56%	-9%	62%	-15%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	56%	-6%	64%	-14%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	64%	51%	13%	60%	4%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	45%	20%	53%	12%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	16	30	32	20	35	34	28				
ELL	33	47	46	33	50	50	29				
BLK	34	49	47	46	47	29	43				
HSP	53	49	44	51	57	44	53				
MUL	57	40		50	70						
WHT	69	69	61	65	70	56	82				
FRL	47	55	52	48	58	49	51				

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	29	28	24	23	35	44	21				
ELL	41	52	54	45	35						
BLK	31	34	35	46	50	35	40				
HSP	57	54	43	61	58	53	69				
MUL	56	57		67	73						
WHT	62	53	50	65	59	53	66				
FRL	47	46	39	53	54	45	60				

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	22	42	44	43	22	22	6				
ELL	46	53		69	41	50					
BLK	42	51	41	45	37	30	29				
HSP	62	65	50	68	48	25	70				
MUL	85			85							
WHT	72	59	65	75	56	39	69				
FRL	52	53	60	56	39	35	42				

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	58
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

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%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
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	42
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	50
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	54
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	67
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.

Math has the lowest number of students scoring at or above the proficient level with 58%. This was a 2% drop from last year. The lowest individual grade level was third grade. Math has been a downward trend for the last two years. While the number of students scoring proficient has declined the number of students making learning gains increased by 5%.

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

Math was the greatest decline with a 2% drop in the number of students scoring at or above the proficient level. Fourth grade had the largest number of students drop, from 64% to 35%. This grade level also had a decrease in the lowest quartile of students making learning gains.

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.

Third grade and fourth grade were both well under the state averages for students scoring proficient in math. Third grade was 15% and 4th grade was 14% below. Both grade levels were also below the district averages as well in math. Another gap is with the African American subgroup. They scored well below the school and state average. This subgroup had only 35% proficient in ELA and 43% in Math. ESE subgroup has the greatest gap when compared to the school and state averages.

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

Reading and science showed the most improvement with the number of students scoring proficient. These two components went up 4% and 5%. The other component that showed improvement was with learning gains in reading. Sixty percent of the students had learning gains this year in ELA. This year the focus was on creating rigorous tasks and small group instruction. Science incorporated hands-on activities with student learning targets and success criteria.

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

The number of students scoring Level 1 on ELA and Math combined has continued to increase. This means there are more students that are below level. The other area of concern is the number of students with attendance issues.

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

1. Increase the number of student scoring at or above the proficient level
2. Decrease the gap between ESE and general population
3. Decrease gap between racial subgroups
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	The number of students scoring at or above proficiency over the last two years has steadily decreased. The number of students making learning gains has also decreased.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase in students scoring at or above proficient will increase from 58% to 63% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Development will focus on LSI Teaming structures and strategies. Teachers will use teaming tasks that will align to the full intent of the standards and increase student autonomy. Small group instruction will be utilized in math to focus on areas of need. Students will be able to work on mastery of standards with immediate feedback and guidance provided by the teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing student engagement has a direct impact on student success. By providing opportunities for students to collaborate together, they will work on social skills and build ownership for learning. Students will spend more time
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development will focus on LSI Teaming strategies. Teachers will participate in two full day trainings led by LSI trainers. Teachers will use LSI Standards Tracker to document student mastery of standards. PLC's will include a book study on Teaming. 2. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning led by instructional coaches, Shari Richard, Megan Long and Melanie Oglesby. Focus of planning will be core instructional strategies, formative assessments and higher order questions with accountable talk. The teachers will also participate in an all day collaborative planning session in order to review data and standards and create lesson plans that include target/ task alignment and teaming strategies. 3. Teachers will use supplemental computer programs to assist with individualized reinforcement of standards. iPads will be utilized as well as laptops in the primary grades. 4. Teachers as well as administration will attend the LSI Conference to deeper their understanding of the LSI strategies. 5. Integration will be utilized among the core content areas to increase student engagement and provide opportunities for utilization of knowledge. As a culminating activity the Museum of Science and Industry will provide hands-on activities. Students will be able to reinforce math concepts through science.
Person Responsible	Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Students Identified as SWD or ELL
Rationale	FSA scores indicate a gap between the performance of general education students and those identified as SWD or ELL. The overall number of ELL students scoring proficient in math was 33% and the number of SWD was 20%. This is well below the overall school proficiency of 58%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the number of SWD and ELL students scoring proficient by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will use teaming tasks that will align to the full intent of the standards and increase student autonomy. Small group instruction will be utilized in math to focus on areas of need. Students will be able to work on mastery of standards with immediate feedback and guidance provided by the teacher. Teachers will use multi-sensory instruction and manipulatives to support a conceptual understanding of math standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing student engagement has a direct impact on student success. By providing opportunities for students to participate in hands on exploration, they will work on real world applications.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development will focus on LSI Teaming strategies. Teachers will participate in two full day trainings led by LSI trainers. Teachers will use LSI Standards Tracker to document student mastery of standards. 2. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning led by instructional coaches, Shari Richard, Megan Long and Melanie Oglesby. Focus of planning will be core instructional strategies, formative assessments and higher order questions with accountable talk. 3. Teachers will use supplemental computer programs to assist with individualized reinforcement of standards. iPads will be utilized in the primary classrooms. 4. Teachers will utilize formative and summative assessments to track mastery of standards. Teachers will then use small group instruction to reteach standards and provide interventions as needed. During small group instruction, students are at centers. Listening centers will be utilized to assist students with comprehension. Students often struggle with reading on grade level text independently. Listening centers will provide the students with the opportunity to hear on grade level text and work on practicing comprehension strategies instead of focusing on decoding. Florida Ready Books will be utilized as a supplemental resource for teachers to provide interventions during Triple i time.
Person Responsible	Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

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.

At Wendell Watson Elementary several activities, committees and opportunities present themselves for parent involvement. These include SAC, PTA, and volunteering. Throughout the school year, family involvement activities are planned that include movie nights, show choir nights, art and music showcase, etc. In the fall, Open House occurs. Grade levels also plan parent nights and teach/review content, standards and expectations.

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.

Nurturing students' social-emotional needs is a top priority for the staff at Wendell Watson Elementary. Students are held to the high expectations of our school-wide behavior system which encourages them to demonstrate PRIDE not only in their academic achievements, but in their social experiences with others. Adult mentors are provided to selected students who need a another adult in their life. Wendell Watson Elementary School Counselor is available for classroom guidance lessons, small groups focused on student needs and one on one check in/check out for goal setting and follow up. All teachers also incorporate Harmony lessons during the school day. The Harmony lessons focus on fostering communication, connection and community both inside and outside the classroom.

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

The ESE Pre-K teacher works with Kindergarten to provide a transition for students prior to the start of their Kindergarten school year. Most Pre-K students transition into an inclusion classroom and varied levels of support are provided. The middle schools representatives provide 5th grade students an overview of class scheduling and learning opportunities. This transition activity happens in the spring of each school year. 5th graders can visit the middle school or that information is provided to them at Wendell Watson Elementary. Middle school elective class groups such as band, chorus, etc. give a performance to 5th graders and provide information for students interested in those programs.

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 Leadership aligns all available resources so that all students are successful. Model classrooms are identified, PLC meetings support the needs provided by data and classroom observations. School budget funds are set aside to support professional learning through collaboration with General Education and ESE teachers. Teacher collaboration is set on a weekly basis within teams and with administration. Kelly Burgess and Tanya Poe-Liburud coordinate all Professional Learning Community Meetings, and arrange all school leadership team meetings.

Tier 2 meetings are supported by Courtney Brown, School Psychologist, Shari Richard, Instructional Coach, Melanie Oglesby, Instructional Coach, and Michelle Vandersteen, School Counselor. Teams meet to discuss on-going progress monitoring data and effective strategies.

Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. This program supports after-school programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents.

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

Wendell Watson Elementary invites the feeder high school to participate in a Cap and Gown walk. The seniors then meet with the fifth grade students to share their high school experiences. They discuss what college they will be attending and their future careers. The school counselor also plans activities that focus on college and careers. There is also a dress up career day held in September. Classrooms also have the year that the class will graduate from high school posted. They are referred to as scholars and the graduating class of, ie 2030.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students Identified as SWD or ELL	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00