Wilson Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wilson Middle School

1005 W SWANN AVE, Tampa, FL 33606

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Keith Fantauzzo

Start Date for this Principal: 1/27/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (79%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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 Middle School

1005 W SWANN AVE, Tampa, FL 33606

[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)
Middle School 6-8	No	27%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

Bulldogs will persevere to become compassionate citizens and successful life-long learners!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Woodrow Wilson Middle School students will be prepared 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
Fantauzzo, Keith	Principal	
Lockett, Kelinda	Assistant Principal	
Fox, Tim	Teacher, K-12	
Ferrebee, Richard	Teacher, K-12	
Moore, Malcolm	Teacher, K-12	
Nadicksbernd, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Sanchez, Michelle	Instructional Media	
Slaughter, Thomas	Teacher, K-12	
Thompson, Jenifer	Teacher, K-12	
Werb, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Paradiso, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
Melius, Annette	Teacher, K-12	
Shafer, Greg	Teacher, K-12	
VanDyke Barnum, Audrey	Teacher, ESE	
Anderson, Sarena	Teacher, K-12	
Glicksteen, Sarah	School Counselor	
Casper, Michelle	SAC Member	
	School Counselor	
Mirasola, Monica	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/27/2020, Keith Fantauzzo

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.*

1

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

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (79%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

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	0	0	0	0	0	212	201	183	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	21	28	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	10	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	10	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	21	0	0	0	0	48

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	5	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/28/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	220	210	227	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	21	20	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	34	12	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	29	14	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	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	6	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	220	210	227	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	21	20	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	34	12	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	29	14	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	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	6	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4

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	79%	51%	54%	83%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	52%	54%	72%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	47%	47%	60%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	84%	55%	58%	88%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	71%	57%	57%	82%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	52%	51%	72%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	74%	47%	51%	68%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	67%	72%	93%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	76%	53%	23%	54%	22%
	2018	78%	52%	26%	52%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	83%	54%	29%	52%	31%
	2018	75%	52%	23%	51%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	76%	53%	23%	56%	20%
	2018	83%	54%	29%	58%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	70%	49%	21%	55%	15%
	2018	85%	48%	37%	52%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	93%	62%	31%	54%	39%
	2018	82%	61%	21%	54%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	38%	31%	7%	46%	-8%
	2018	36%	29%	7%	45%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	74%	47%	27%	48%	26%
	2018	78%	48%	30%	50%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	67%	27%	71%	23%
2018	85%	65%	20%	71%	14%
Compare		9%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	63%	34%	61%	36%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	98%	63%	35%	62%	36%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	44	41	37	43	39	25	69	60		
ELL	35	52	45	52	50	48	8	77			
ASN	85	53		95	75				100		
BLK	42	47	55	61	72	63	31	70	91		
HSP	72	66	56	75	64	63	63	88	87		
MUL	93	79		96	88			100			
WHT	82	63	54	88	73	65	82	96	88		
FRL	59	58	52	67	58	56	45	79	87		
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	33	39	31	50	48	47	40	45	75		
ELL	37	53	59	57	53	50		38			
ASN	95	76		95	76		100		100		
BLK	38	53	52	64	62	52	56	71	91		
HSP	68	65	57	77	66	55	62	73	92		
MUL	83	69		75	68						
WHT	86	66	51	93	75	74	84	91	94		
FRL	59	55	53	68	58	51	55	71	86		
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	28	38	28	46	63	57	8	53			
ELL	23	56	47	36	57	50					
ASN	91	70		100	90			100	100		
BLK	48	56	54	57	71	60	25	84	64		
HSP	74	64	55	80	76	64	64	85	93		
MUL	90	74		90	89						
WHT	88	77	63	92	85	79	72	95	98		

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	61	58	45	70	75	64	56	78	92		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	750
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
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	71
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	91
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	77
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	63
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 data component with the lowest performance using the Grade Level Data was 8th Grade Math, which is Pre-Algebra with a 38%. Factors that contributed to last year's low performance was that

there were only approximately 20 or so students that took Pre-Algrebra and these are usually the students that had scored an FSA Math AL score of a 1 or 2 the year prior

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

The data component the showed the greatest decline using the Grade Level Data was 6th Grade Math with a 15 point drop. Factors that contributed to this decline include the loss of 1 highly qualified teacher and a replacement teacher that is not only newer to teaching but was also in her first year teaching middle school at Wilson

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 using the Grade Level Data was 8th Grade Math, Pre-Algebra, with a negative 8 point gap as compared to the state average. Factors that contributed to this gap include that last year was the teacher's first time teaching Pre-Algebra

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 using the Grade Level Data was 7th Grade Math with an 11 point improvement from the previous year. There were 2 highly qualified teachers teaching last school year

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

Potential areas of concern from the Early Warning Sign data are students that have course failures in either Language Arts or Math due to an increase of 43 students, from 16 to 59. An additional potential area of concern is attendance below 90%; due to an increase of 18 students, from 39 to 57

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

1. Growth for all students
2. Smooth transition back for students and staff from distance learning that occurred during quarter 4 last year
3. School Culture

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus will concentrate on how teachers differentiate within their classroom. Given Wilson's size and population, multiple levels of learners are within one class. This makes it difficult for teachers to be able to teach to all students. This is evident in the grade level school data which identifies that the majority of our struggling students fall within the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup. Differentiation training was also one of the highest rated requests for PD by our teachers in our 2020 ASQI Climate Survey.
Measurable Outcome:	ALL students to demonstrate at least a year's growth from the previous year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development will be offered throughout the school year addressing differentiation in the classroom. We have master teachers that will offer model classrooms (with administration providing substitutes when needed), rolling inservice offerings, trainers provided by the district's professional development office will be requested to come train on site and/or administration will provide the dates and times of appropriate professional development offerings off site.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Knowledge is power. Some of our teachers need to realize that effective differentiation is possible. All of our teachers believe that all students can learn, but some are having a difficult time being able to reach all of the students in their diverse classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify teachers that have mastered differentiation within their classroom

Person Responsible	Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

2. Create a schedule for model classroom visits utilizing master teachers. The schedule should offer opportunities for each period for observation. Provide subs as needed

Person Responsible	Nicole Paradiso (nicole.paradiso@hcps.net)

3. Offer rolling inservices focused on different aspects of differentiation

Person Responsible	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

4. Either offer training to be given by the office of professional standards on campus or provide dates and times of offerings off campus

Person Responsible	Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus will be expanded upon this year. It was identified using the Student Survey results from one year prior. One question was concerning if students at this school treat others with respect and 43% of students were unsure. This area of focus impacts student learning and success directly because if students do not feel like they are being treated with respect then there academic achievement will be negatively impacted.
Measurable Outcome:	To ensure that more students feel that they are treated with respect and treat others with respect at this school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Wilson Unites PLC teams will be developed again this year with days/times set aside throughout the year to build stronger relationships throughout the school. We will adjust the program a bit to focus on the need to treat each individual equitably regardless of race, color, religion, etc. Adjustments will also be made to adapt to the way of learning that we will be facing this school year due to COVID-19.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Last year, a third Guidance Counselor was hired so that each grade level will have their own guidance counselor. Additional staff resources will allow more students to have access to a Guidance Counselor more often. Using Staff/Student Wilson Unites PLCs allow smaller groups or vertically teamed students to interact with each other and staff to foster relationship building among all stakeholders.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assign each student and teacher to a Wilson United PLC color team

Person Responsible	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

2. Set aside days and times every 6-8 weeks for each team to meet and work together on various activities throughout the year

Person Responsible	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

3. Determine and plan the activities that will be completed with each Wilson Unites team including bringing in business partners and other community members to speak and interact with our students and faculty

Person Responsible	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

4. Elicit feedback from staff/students to make adjustments and changes if/when necessary to foster building relationships. The feedback we received last school year will be used to assist the development of the Wilson Unites program this school year

Person Responsible	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- We have hired a new, dynamic 6th grade Math teacher that we believe will work well with our current teacher of 6th grade Math. This teacher comes to us with very good track history of increasing student growth
- This will be the second year that our teacher of 8th grade Math (Pre-Algebra) will be paired with our Math department head. This relationship is blossoming and I believe the students will benefit greatly this year from their work together

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.

Please reference our Wilson Unites program in Section III, Area of Focus "Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity".

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.