Wilson Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wilson Elementary School

702 W ENGLISH ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kayla Forcucci
Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	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* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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

Wilson Elementary School

702 W ENGLISH ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

To guide each student to his or her greatest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Students For Life

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
Forcucci, Kayla	Principal	Curriculum and Data Leadership, Monitor other school leaders responsibilities, Lead staff PD. Nikita Armstrong: Guidance Counselor, MTSS Facilitator
Kim, Catherine	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Curriculum and Data Leadership, Monitor other school leaders responsibilities, Lead staff PD.
Burnside, Kristin	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach: Data PLC Facilitator, Instructional Coach, Small group instructor, PD Instructor
Donini, Megan	Instructional Coach	Math Resource/Coach, Data PLC Facilitator, Instructional Coach, Small group facilitator, PD Inctor

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Kayla Forcucci

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
16

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)	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* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	45	62	45	49	46	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Attendance below 90 percent	6	11	10	9	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	12	24	25	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Course failure in Math	25	33	16	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	4	13	2	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	64	56	54	49	64	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	336
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	4	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	22	23	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	1	0	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	7	7	6	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	64	56	54	49	64	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	336
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	4	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	22	23	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	1	0	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	7	7	6	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	43%	52%	57%	45%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	55%	58%	47%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	50%	53%	38%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	54%	63%	58%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	41%	57%	62%	60%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	46%	51%	36%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	50%	53%	63%	48%	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	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
	2018	43%	53%	-10%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
	2018	59%	51%	8%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	57%	-21%	64%	-28%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
	2018	59%	54%	5%	61%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	32	36		44	43						
ELL	42	35	36	40	38	42	39				
BLK	40			55							
HSP	36	41	35	39	38	35	45				
WHT	52	54		44	42		55				
FRL	39	41	33	39	40	35	39				
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	58	62		53	62						
ELL	47	62		42	62						
BLK	36			43							
HSP	49	64	65	51	61	53	42				
WHT	64	73		64	61		70				
FRL	48	65	67	54	59	57	48				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	24	13		33	40						
ELL	31	39	38	50	56	40	25				
HSP	41	43	39	53	59	37	56				
WHT	56	48		71	64		83				
FRL	41	44	38	56	59	36	60				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	48
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	43
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	
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	49
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	43
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.

2019 FSA results revealed math learning gains for the bottom quartile was the lowest performance. 19-20 Winter IReady data supports that math proficiency and gains continue to be a struggle. Past math gains can be contributed to support from an onsite math coach working with staff and students. The school earns 2.5 supplemental units. The last two years the math coach position was .5 at Wilson (paired with another school) however we were unable to fill the position. The new math program "Envision" was introduced this past year and used along with the online planning tools provided from the district. Team planning for math was inconsistent at the school site too.

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

Reading learning gains for the bottom quartile experienced the greatest decline. In years past staff serving in special roles (Art, Music, PE) were utilized to work with small groups of students in grades 3,4,and 5. Staff change and less allocation over the last two years resulted in a gap for this support. The Reading Coach had to become a 5th grade teacher to support a classroom vacancy. During the 19-20 school year we began with no 5th grade teachers and a vacancy in 4th grade. Late in the first semester we were able to hire two ELP tutors. The year prior Wilson began the year with no

Guidance Counselor, Social Worker or Psychologist (all whom normally support MTSS) and the MTSS process and RTI support was lacking. We are still in the building process for MTSS.

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.

Fourth grade math had the greatest gap (-28%) when compared to the state average on 2019 FSA. Those students as 5th graders continue to show low performance in math on 1920 IReady measures. Students were co-enrolled in Hillsborough Virtual School since there was not a teacher. In one of the classes a chronic severe behavior problem impacted the momentum of instruction. A lack of teachers, behavioral disruptions, and uneven administrative support contributed to low performance.

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

When reviewing data trends of 2019 FSA and 1920 IReady measures we see that the math learning gains for the bottom quartile is not as low as it was three years ago.

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

The SWD index for 2019 was 39%. Two years ago the VE teacher was new to VE. During 19-20 an experienced VE teacher filled the role but has now moved schools. Another experienced VE teacher has been hired coming from out-of-county. This is an area to monitor for this coming year since the teacher filling this position will be new to the school and county. With COVID uncertainties we will also face making up lost instruction for students and possiblie continued disruptions.

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

1. Core Content Achievement, SWD, and Hispanic students
2. ELA and Math Gains, SWD, Lowest 25%tile
3. Science achievement
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There was a drop across all content areas in proficiency, gains, and bottom quartile. SWD achievement below 41% There was a limited number of teaching staff to support RtI, ELP, and teacher planning. SWD teacher was new to ESE.Many of the anchor staff for these supports moved schools and there were limited data dives to keep student lists current with instructional need or positions were vacant. PLC meetings and ILT meetings lacked focus of using student data and drilling down to student instructional needs.Agendas were not set prior to meetings and teachers had difficulty interpreting data with out instructional coach assistance.Administration allowed more atonomy than in the past and teachers do not have the proprer development on how to lead these groups within themselves.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2021, 60% or more students will score at mid or late grade level on I Ready Diagnostic Reading and Math. By May 2021, student proficiency will be 45% on Spring FSA Reading and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standard alignement for lessons, Small group instruction, coaching cycles and facilitated planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Focus on Grade 3-5 I-Ready lessons and support tools, Differentiated Instruction, strengthening ELA ares in primary grades and Instructional Coaches during planning provide the support to keep lessons standard based and aligned with student need, tighter focus on student need during MTSS, and a help train teachers on how to use student data to differentiate and meet student need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Math Resource and Reading Coach modeling lessons for core teachers. Lesson focus based on results of interim and formative assessments along with teacher input. Lesson modeling weekly at the beginning of the year. After first quarter coaches will continue lesson modeling as needed but have a greater focus on small groups of students and lesson planning (content and pedagogy focused) with teachers.

Person Responsible	Catherine Kim (catherine.kim@hcps.net)

2. Weekly lesson planning with instructional coach to select best instructional strategies and correct any misconceptions. All grades will plan with Instructional Coaches, greater focus for grades 3-5 and more time may be spent with them after evaluation of the first quarter progression. During third quarter instructional coach focus will shift to working with small groups of students the majority of the time. Some lesson support will still be in place for struggling teachers.

Person Responsible	Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

. 3. PLC/ILTRegular meeting to analyze student data and instructional need. Groups meet once a month. Teacher PLCs meet three times a month. PLCs will focus on student data from iReady, monthly assessments, and other common assessments. Student proficiency, lower 25%, and SWD progression will be the focus. These groups will also have priority for ELP sessions.

Person Responsible	Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@hcps.net)

4. Use iReady data to strategically plan small group instruction both in school and after school with iReady ToolBox.

Person Responsible	Megan Donini (megan.donini@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

5. Purchase and utilize Lucy Calkins Writing Units of Study with primary grades to increase their writing skills which will better support them as intermediate writers. Train all primary teachers and meet weekly for planning.

Person Responsible	Kayla Forcucci (kayla.forcucci@hcps.net)

6. Use of Next Step Froward in Guided Reading. Reading Coach use of book with K-5 teachers while planning, in coaching Cycles, and through small book study

Person Responsible	Kristin Burnside (kristin.burnside@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

This year we will begin with a full VE staff. Both are coming from out-of-county Training early in the year will support the shift in counties. Close monitoring of VE student data is scheduled and VE teacher schedules are protected to ensure they are consistently in the classroom.
COVID interruption of instruction this past year has created an entire quarter of learning gap. Students engaged in e-Learning unevenly. Winter IReady diagnostic information has been used to determine "bubble"students and the new report "PreRequisite Report" from iReady will be used in planning to support student needs. Close monitoring of all student data and structures for standard aligned instruction will occurr this year. Administration and Instructional Leadership team will support and monitor these plans.

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.

Positive interactions at school combined with consistent character lessons result in happy, well-adjusted attitudes, involvement in school activities, character conscious students driven to reach attainable achievement levels.

Wilson's Champions of Character program (based on themedalofhonor.com lessons) is steeped in Citizenship and Patriotism . Our character development plan will be established through a house system

based on four character traits: Courage, Integrity, Commitment, and Giving. Wilson has "The Essential 15" actions which support our 3R's. Teachers use these Essentials in their classroom and throughout the school so expectations are clear and consistent across the campus. These school-wide essentials are visible to all students, parents, visitors, and volunteers.

WILSON WILDCAT EXPACTATIONS

Expectation #1 Be Respectful!
Essential 1 Always say thank you when given something. There is no excuse for not showing appreciation.
Essential 2 Hold the door for people rather than letting it close on them.
Essential 3 When responding to any adult, you must answer by saying "Yes ma'am" or "No sir."
Essential 4 Greet visitors and make them feel welcome to the school.
Essential 5 Make eye contact when someone is speaking, keep your eyes on him or her at all times.

Expectation #2 Be Responsible!
Essential 6 When we read together in class, you must follow along. If called on to read, you must know exactly where we are and begin reading immediately.
Essential 7 No matter what the circumstances, be honest.
Essential 8 NEVER say the words "I can't" in our classroom. Ever.
Essential 9 We will follow certain classroom protocols. We will be organized, efficient, and on task.
Essential 10 While you are with a substitute teacher, you will obey the same rules that you follow when I am with you.

Expectation #3 Be a Role Model!
Essential 11 Surprise others by performing random acts of kindness.
Essential 12 If someone in the class wins a game of does something well, we will congratulate that person.
Essential 13 If someone bumps into you, even if it was not your fault, say, "Excuse me."
Essential 14 When given an assignment there is to be no moaning or whining.
Essential 15 After eating in the cafeteria or elsewhere, be responsible for your trash.

When misconduct occurs, the character development plan will focus the student's attention on the following areas:
1. Define the problem.
2. Solve the problem.
3. Assume responsibility for his/her own actions

The plan encourages the use of logical and natural consequences for inappropriate behavior at school.

When an infraction to an essential occurs:
1. Teachers should discuss the behavior with the student(s)
2. Student to write in agenda
3. Student reflection
4. Guidance Counseling
5. Call Parent
6. Discipline Referral (for extreme cases)
All infractions of the essentials will be handled on an individual basis. The action plan is designed to reinforce good character, lifelong behavior skills and choices. Issues outside of the classroom scope and sequence are handled by administration.

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				$144,490.17
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	4801 - Wilson Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$73,876.77
			Notes: Reading Coach			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	4801 - Wilson Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$59,109.93
			Notes: Math Coach/Resource			
	6300	690-Computer Software	4801 - Wilson Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$3,740.00
			Notes: iReady Tool Box			
	6300	520-Textbooks	4801 - Wilson Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,344.59
			Notes: Lucy Caulkins Writing Unit of Study materials			
	6300	100-Salaries	4801 - Wilson Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,300.00
			Notes: Lucy Caulkins Writing Unit of Study PD pay for teachers			
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	4801 - Wilson Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,599.00
			Notes: Lucy Caulkins Writing Unit of Study PD from publishing co.			
	6400	590-Other Materials and Supplies	4801 - Wilson Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,019.88
			Notes: Next Step Forward in Guided Reading, Book Study			
	3336	510-Supplies	4801 - Wilson Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$500.00
			Notes: Materials for training and communication			
					Total:	$144,490.17