

Broward County Public Schools

Whispering Pines Exceptional Education



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Whispering Pines Exceptional Education Center

3609 SW 89TH AVE, M IR Amar, FL 33025

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michael Gleason

Start Date for this Principal: 1/3/2007

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: F (30%)
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	CS&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 Broward 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Whispering Pines Exceptional Education Center

3609 SW 89TH AVE, M IR Amar, FL 33025

[no web address on file]

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)
Combination School PK-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	F	I*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

The mission of Whispering Pines School is to ensure an optimum teaching and learning environment, which sets high expectations and enables all students to achieve individual maximum potential through a collaborative effort of pertinent stakeholders. Our commitment to address the academic, social, emotional and behavioral needs of students representing a diversity of experience and cultures to promote a positive self-concept, which will allow students to be productive citizen's in today's challenging society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to create a welcoming, participatory and caring climate for learning through collaboration with families, community members, and stakeholders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Alexander, Erica	Teacher, ESE	Administrative Support/SIP Contact
Bennett, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Instructional
Kruse, Toni	Other	Behavior
Gleason, Michael	Principal	Administration
Henderson, Catherine	Assistant Principal	Administration/Main contact for SIP
Caicedo, Sara	SAC Member	Parent
Hogan, Valorie	Other	ESE Specialist
Knowling, Robin	Attendance/Social Work	Family Counselor
Bernard, Celeste	School Counselor	Guidance

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/3/2007, Michael Gleason

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.*

0

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: F (30%)
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	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	9	7	10	13	16	18	39	36	22	39	29	31	269
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	2	2	4	3	14	13	8	16	11	21	96
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	1	5	3	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	3	2	3	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	11	9	9	5	9	6	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	12	16	9	10	11	9	84
	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	1	4	6	8	7	18	11	10	7	5	10	87

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	1	1	3	7	6	3	4	6	0	0	0	2	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	4	4	8	28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

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	2	8	11	19	18	21	29	46	34	25	30	20	36	299
Attendance below 90 percent	50	38	36	21	6	14	35	37	27	52	30	35	72	453
One or more suspensions	0	13	18	0	0	14	14	17	12	12	13	20	3	136
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	9	36	0	10	6	83
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	100	90	75	68	75	87	50	75	80	83	783

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	9	21	11	19	24	41	32	40	33	45	56	331

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	13	0	16	17	14	14	11	18	0	0	0	42	145
Students retained two or more times	0	0	9	0	0	0	3	7	9	16	13	20	22	99

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	2	8	11	19	18	21	29	46	34	25	30	20	36	299
Attendance below 90 percent	50	38	36	21	6	14	35	37	27	52	30	35	72	453
One or more suspensions	0	13	18	0	0	14	14	17	12	12	13	20	3	136
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	9	36	0	10	6	83
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	100	90	75	68	75	87	50	75	80	83	783

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	9	21	11	19	24	41	32	40	33	45	56	331

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	13	0	16	17	14	14	11	18	0	0	0	42	145
Students retained two or more times	0	0	9	0	0	0	3	7	9	16	13	20	22	99

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	0%	58%	61%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	58%	62%	0%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	52%	0%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	51%	56%	0%	46%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	74%	78%	0%	71%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	0%	60%	-60%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	62%	-62%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	9%	59%	-50%	56%	-47%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	25%	57%	-32%	54%	-29%
	2018	6%	54%	-48%	52%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				
07	2019	19%	55%	-36%	52%	-33%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	6%	54%	-48%	51%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	15%	59%	-44%	56%	-41%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
09	2019	33%	57%	-24%	55%	-22%
	2018	20%	55%	-35%	53%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		33%				
10	2019	22%	53%	-31%	53%	-31%
	2018	15%	53%	-38%	53%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	65%	-65%	62%	-62%
	2018	10%	63%	-53%	62%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	8%	67%	-59%	64%	-56%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	9%	64%	-55%	60%	-51%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	11%	58%	-47%	55%	-44%
	2018	11%	55%	-44%	52%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
07	2019	13%	53%	-40%	54%	-41%
	2018	10%	54%	-44%	54%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	5%	45%	-40%	46%	-41%
	2018	6%	47%	-41%	45%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	8%	49%	-41%	53%	-45%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	5%	43%	-38%	48%	-43%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	33%	67%	-34%	67%	-34%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	65%	-65%
Compare		33%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	71%	-41%	71%	-41%
2018	16%	70%	-54%	71%	-55%
Compare		14%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	67%	-13%	70%	-16%
2018	53%	66%	-13%	68%	-15%
Compare		1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	14%	61%	-47%	61%	-47%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Compare		14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%
2018	7%	51%	-44%	56%	-49%
Compare		-7%			

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	14	43		10	32		13	48		22	
BLK	13	48		5	33			14		10	
HSP	6			6						27	
WHT	21	50		22							
FRL	13	42		9	34		4	26		11	
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	23
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	159
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	18
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	13
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	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	31
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	20
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Being a specialized school addressing the unique needs of ESE students grade K-12, including three satellite campuses, and a transient population, the data sets that are compiled do not often reflect actual school-wide performance. The data component showing the lowest performance is 3rd grade Math. Contributing factors include student absenteeism, emotional and behavioral barriers to learning, in addition to the 3rd grade teacher required an extended leave, and the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

With the data presented the data component showing the greatest decline is 3rd grade Math. Contributing factors include student absenteeism, emotional and behavioral barriers to learning, in addition to the 3rd grade teacher required an extended leave, and the COVID-19 pandemic.

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 that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 3rd grade Math. The contributing factor as compared to the state average would be that a vast majority of the student population are ESE. Precipitating factors leading to center school placement lead to gaps in foundational skills in mathematics.

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 Biology EOC. Actions taken were integration of Canvas Digital Learning System, a specialized focus on learning strategies and test taking tips.

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

Attendance and level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Attendance
2. Social Emotional Learning
3. Student gains on statewide assessments

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Attendance rate is important because students are more likely to succeed in academics when they attend school consistently. It is difficult for the teacher and class to build their skills and progress if a large number of student are frequently absent.

Measurable Outcome: Student will demonstrate a reduction of 5% in the school's chronic absenteeism.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erica Alexander (erica.alexander2@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Social work home visits, availability of a full-time school nurse and family counselors, attendance incentives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Wrap-around services to fully accommodate our high needs population.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students who have been absent more than 10 days
2. Weekly attendance concerns brought to Rtl team
3. Student will be rewarded for improved attendance.
4. Therapeutic counselor contact home upon discussion in Rtl meetings.
5. Referral to SSW for home visit

Person Responsible Celeste Bernard (celeste.bernard@browardschools.com)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social Emotional Learning instills greater motivation to learn, a deeper commitment to school, increased time devoted to schoolwork, better classroom behavior, and improved attendance and graduation rates.

Measurable Outcome: Students will demonstrate skills related to achieving personal and academic goals, and an ability to prevent, manage, and resolve interpersonal conflicts in constructive ways by the end of the 2021 school year as evidenced by the reduction of behavior calls.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robin Knowling (robin.nowling@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of district resources such as Leaps curriculum, utilization of Suite360, and weekly therapeutic sessions with assigned therapists.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Leaps curriculum and Suite360 provides comprehensive lesson plans and interactive multi-modal assessment tools.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher trainings on Leaps and Suite360
2. Implementation of Leaps lesson plans
3. Student engagement in Suite360 character development
4. Progress monitoring through a review of behavioral data conducted quarterly
5. Celebrating student success in the area of SEL

Person Responsible Robin Knowling (robin.nowling@browardschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Historical assessment data indicates that our students tend to struggle with demonstrating mastery of concepts via standardized assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	This year our focus will be in the area of mathematics and our goal is a 5% increase in the percentage of students earning a level 3 or higher on the FSA Math/EOC assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erica Alexander (erica.alexander2@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing progress monitoring and instructional adjustments will be data-driven from sources such as iReady and Math Nation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Screening tools such as iReady measure student growth and identifies students who need additional support. The teacher then can then provide data-driven instruction and remediation. Math Nation is aligned to Florida Math Standards and provides interactive videos as a supplemental instructional tool.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher trainings on iReady, Math Nation
2. Implementation of iReady assessments
3. Student engagement in Math Nation
4. Ongoing progress monitoring through iReady
5. Celebrating student success in the area of academic gains

Person Responsible Melissa Bennett (melissa.bennett@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In keeping with our school vision we will continue to work towards creating a welcoming, participatory and caring climate for learning through collaboration with families, community members, and stakeholders. All instructional staff participate in PLCs and professional developments to help our student become college and career ready.

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 goal as a school is for families to feel welcomed, valued, and respected by Whispering Pines School staff; two-way communication and relationship building with families are facilitated by Administration, School Social Workers, Family Counselors, Community Liaison, and Classroom Teachers to meet changing family and community circumstances. Opportunities are provided for family support and development through the family partnership process and through intentional parent/family peer groups within Whispering Pines School and community

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6000	100-Salaries	1752 - Whispering Pines Exceptional Education Center	General Fund		\$1,500.00
Total:						\$1,500.00