Wendell Watson Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 8/1/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2019-20 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%)
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

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	75%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Part I: School Information

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burgess, Kelly	Principal	Principal Kelly Burgess leads instruction, school improvement, school safety, and provides management of all school functions. She leads observations, evaluations, professional development and data reviews. Mrs. Burgess works with PTA and SAC. Student data is monitored and analyzed through data chats and collaborative planning.
Poe-Liburd, Tanya	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Tanya Liburd serves as textbook manager, testing coordinator, and leads discipline. She works closely with the school PBIS team to analyze school data. She provides teachers with classroom management support. She monitors instruction through daily walkthroughs and provides frequent forms of feedback.
Oglesby, Melanie	Instructional Coach	Melanie Oglesby, Math Coach, provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and the implementation of rigorous math instruction as it pertains to Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and assists teachers with standards-based lesson planning.
Long, Megan	Instructional Coach	Megan Long, Reading Coach, provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and the implementation of rigorous reading instruction as it pertains to Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and assists teachers with standards-based lesson planning.
Martin, Nicole	Other	Nicole Martin, Interventionist, provides intensive remediation through small group instruction. She analyzes data with the classroom teachers to scaffold instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
Vandersteen, Michelle	School Counselor	Michelle Vandersteen analyzes and monitors Tier 2 and Tier 3 data and assists with parent conferences. She provides support for students that need social and emotional support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/1/2016, Kelly Burgess

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.*
3

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
50

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	137	146	132	145	139	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	835
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	5	2	3	4	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	3	1	2	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	25	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	32	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Dec. 2019 Star Reading level 1	0	0	0	29	19	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Dec. 2019 Star Math level 1	0	0	0	19	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
	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	3	1	2	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	5	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/2/2020

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	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

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	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

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	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%
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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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				

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	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%	0
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%	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
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	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	67
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	52
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.

The students in the lowest 25% category scored the lowest in reading and math. Only 47% of the students in this category made a learning gain in math with only 54% in ELA. When the students took the mid-year STAR assessment, the students making a learning gain were even lower, with 42% in

ELA and 46% in math. This is an indicator that shows that there is a gap between the the ESE subgroup and the rest of the school population. The number of students making a learning gain in ELA and math were significant. Again, this is an indicator that there are gaps between the subgroups.

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. The STAR data indicates that during the school year, ELA dropped by 2 percentage points a the mid year point. After school was offered, however transportation is still an issue for our students in the lowest quartile. Students still struggle with mastery of their basic math facts and spend the majority of the time trying to determine those simple facts. This hinders the students ability to master more complex skills.

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 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 was 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 students learning targets and success criteria.

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

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 students scoring at or above the proficient level
2. Decrease the gap between ESE and the general population
3. Decrease the gap between racial subgroups
4. Targeted small group interventions based on student needs
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is on instructional practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction. This focus is important as increasing the rigor of standards-aligned instruction has a direct impact on student success. Students will be able to work on mastery of standards with immediate feedback and guidance provided by the teacher. The number of students scoring at the proficient level in math has steadily decreased over the last two years. The focus will be on making sure that the instruction is aligned to the full intent of the standard.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome is to increase the students scoring proficient in math and reading by 4 percentage points.
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. Students will learn to collaborate and communicate with their peers and engage in rigorous, standards-based tasks. Targeted small group instruction will be utilized in math and ELA to focus on areas of need. Groups will be differentiated based upon formative and summative data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing student engagement has a direct impact on student success. By providing opportunities to collaborate together, they will work on social skills and build ownership for learning. Students will spend more time on tasks that are aligned to the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions led by the instructional coaches, Melanie Oglesby, Megan Long and Melissa Alexander. Focus of planning will be reviewing standards, creating tasks aligned to the full intent of the standards and creating formative assessments. Teachers will discuss what knowledge and skills the students need to know to be proficient. Teachers will also participate in all day collaborative planning sessions in order to review data, standards and create lessons that include teaming strategies. During the summer, teachers will participate in collaborative planning to reflect on the year and plan rigorous tasks for the students to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible	Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will use supplemental computer programs to assist with individualized reinforcement of standards. iPads will be utilized as well as laptop computers. Teachers will also use supplemental workbooks during tutoring to provide differentiated instruction based on student needs. Teachers will be provided with instructional materials to use during small group instruction. Classroom libraries will be used to differentiate instruction during small groups.

Person Responsible	Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

Professional Development will focus on LSI Teaming strategies. Teachers will participate in a full day of training led by LSI trainers. PLC's will include a book study on the Power of Student Teams.

Person Responsible	Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Academic Interventionist will provide small group instruction for students identified in Tier 3. Data will be monitored by the Leadership team. Reading and Math coaches will be used to co-teach with teachers that show a need for additional assistance with providing instructional strategies. The administration team will provide constructive feedback during observations.

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.

Our school motto at Wendell Watson is "PRIDE is 5!" Our PBIS committee meets monthly to discuss what is going well and ways in which we can improve our school culture and environment. The PBIS committee also develops our monthly rewards for those students who show PRIDE on a daily basis. The committee is comprised of teachers and members of the leadership team. Every day students work to earn 5 PRIDE points and at the end of the month if students have earned 80% of their monthly points they are rewarded. This PRIDE reward is highly promoted by the staff. Parents are also involved because they check their child's agenda daily to see how many points their child earned. Families and teachers are working together to help their children exude positive behaviors in school. In addition to monthly PRIDE rewards, we recognize an "Eagle of the Month" from each classroom. Teachers nominate one student from their class who has been a positive role model for their classmates and showed PRIDE throughout the month. These students are then recognized during their lunch period at the end of the month and eat lunch with a member of the leadership team. Their pictures are also posted in the cafeteria for the entire month. Staff members also pass out "high 5s" to classes who are walking in a quiet, straight line throughout the campus. Administrators also give out a "high 5" when they see a classroom working together and reflect our school expectations. This has a positive impact on our school culture because students have to work together as a team to earn this reward. They begin to build each other up and remind one another to follow the expectations so they can all be rewarded.

Parents serve on the school SAC committee. They are active participants in the school PTA. Our stakeholders assist with writing and reviewing the Parent Family and Engagement plan.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**