

Martin County School District

Willoughby Learning Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Willoughby Learning Center

5150 SE WILLOUGHBY BLVD, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/wlc

Demographics

Principal: Debra Stull

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2020

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	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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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 was approved by the Martin County School Board on 9/15/2020.

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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Willoughby Learning Center

5150 SE WILLOUGHBY BLVD, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/wlc

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	Yes	%
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

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin County School Board on 9/15/2020.

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 Willoughby Learning Center is to:

- Provide a learning environment that respects the dignity of every student.
- Develop the unique gifts of each student ensuring the achievement of each and every individual's extraordinary purpose.
- Expand opportunities through individualized instruction in collaboration with community resources.
- Explore all possibilities to reach the highest expectations for our student's success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Explore all possibilities for students to succeed

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
Wilkins, Bryan	Principal	
Bartsch, Lani	Teacher, ESE	
Mason, Suzan	Psychologist	
Davis, Laura	Teacher, ESE	
Raimo, Makayla	Other	
Lebeau, Nancy	Other	
	Instructional Coach	
Browning, Justin	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/7/2020, Debra Stull

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

11

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	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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	0	0	0	2	2	8	12	6	17	5	7	5	64	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	4	17	2	5	5	45	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	3	4	10	2	2	0	29	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	6	16	0	1	4	36	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	5	5	25	

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	2	2	8	12	6	17	5	7	5	64	

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	0	4	1	3	0	1	1	10	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/7/2020

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	1	2	4	3	3	6	4	12	18	12	65	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	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	0	1	2	4	3	3	6	3	10	15	9	56

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	3	3	7	11	9	41

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	1	0	0	1	2	6	8	9	27	7	7	11	20	99
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	24	4	5	10	19	76
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	5	14	2	2	0	10	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	17	4	6	6	6	53

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	0	0	1	2	6	8	9	27	7	7	11	20	99

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	11	3	7	4	1	33

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%	33%	61%	0%	35%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	46%	59%	0%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	44%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	64%	59%	0%	54%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	53%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	31%	56%	0%	33%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	95%	78%	0%	48%	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%	54%	-54%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	57%	-57%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	62%	-62%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	61%	-61%	55%	-55%
	2018	8%	62%	-54%	53%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	13%	59%	-46%	53%	-40%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	58%	-58%	62%	-62%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	67%	-67%	64%	-64%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	64%	-64%	60%	-60%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	64%	-64%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	67%	-67%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	58%	-58%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	74%	-36%	67%	-29%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	79%	-79%	71%	-71%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	78%	-78%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	74%	-74%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	7%	75%	-68%	61%	-54%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	62%	-62%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	65%	-65%	57%	-57%
2018	27%	61%	-34%	56%	-29%
Compare		-27%			

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	10	35									
WHT	16	31					20				
FRL	11	38		7							
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	25
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	125
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	17
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	19
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA. Contributing factors include students with disabilities taking their assessments for the first time to determine the need to waivers as well as students whom have been retained entering the school at different intervals throughout the year.

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

Data showing the greatest decline the last year was the pass rate for the ELA examination. Contributing factors include both students not taking the examination as well as the need for additional interventions such as PBIS for encouragement.

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.

8th grade ELA data for 2019 showed the greatest gap compared to the state average due to the number of students testing compared the pass rate for the state average. Students taking the examination passed at a 0% rate.

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

The data showing the most improvement is the Algebra EOC for 2019. The actions taken include additional work with students.

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

Reflecting upon the EWS data, one potential area of concern is attendance.

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

1. Increase the number of students passing the ELA examination by 5%
2. Increase attendance average for students by 5%
3. Decrease the number of suspensions by 10%.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our area of focus will be reading comprehension.

Measurable Outcome:

The IPS coach will monitor reading grades in each reading class. Every student will take a reading class.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bryan Wilkins (wilkinb@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Small group instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Most behavior students struggle with reading comprehension. Hence, they act out when they don't understand the material.

Action Steps to Implement

PD during the back to school week. With scheduled implementation to each classroom.

Person Responsible

Bryan Wilkins (wilkinb@martinschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Willoughby Learning Center has a large population of Student's with Disabilities who have emotional and/or behavioral needs. These student's behavior impedes their learning and the learning of others, and their performance in class and on standardized assessment is greatly impacted. This are was identified as an area of focus due to

Measurable Outcome: Students with Disabilities will increase their proficiency on FSA ELA and Math Assessments by 5% with 75% achieving positive growth scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Justin Browning (brownij2@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Ongoing PLC's with regularly scheduled data dialogue, engagement pop ins, increase classroom management support/training and increased auditing of lesson plans.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As a school, WLC has increased collaboration efforts as a school wide PLC team to analyze data on a weekly basis related to student behavior in class. WLC has partnered with the MCSD's behavior team to revise point sheet collection system, and train staff members on research based classroom management strategies. Teachers have committed to Lesson Plans being submitted multiple times per month to assist with promoting engagement inside the classroom from bell to bell.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Share of prior year performance
2. Calendar planning for PLC team meetings
3. Creation of updated point system data
4. Regular data progress monitoring

Person Responsible Justin Browning (brownij2@martinschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: WLC has a large population of students whose families are from economically disadvantage homes. Often these families struggle with the time and resources needed to assist with their students school success, provide opportunities to enhance learning following school hours, and provide their children with as many opportunities to be involved with positive experiences in school and in the community.

Measurable Outcome: Student's from disadvantaged homes will increase their proficiency on the FSA ELA assessment by 5% with 75% achieving positive growth scores. .

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Justin Browning (brownij2@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will be involved in regular professional development from WLC mental health partner that will better equip them to work with students from low income homes, and trauma. In addition, teachers will attend professional development opportunities that teach close reading strategies to assist with students understanding and comprehension of text.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers need to be empathetic when working with the students at WLC who are from disadvantage homes and/or experienced trauma. These students have different needs than students whose basis needs are met and teachers will experience greater success if they are informed of the facts behind students from disadvantaged homes. Close reading strategies teach students how to interact with the text and be an active reader.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review Previous Years Data
2. Planning Professional Developments across year
3. Mental Health Agency Training Series
4. Close Reader Professional Development
5. Progress Monitoring of Student performance

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Willoughby Learning Center's White Demographic includes students who often are from economically disadvantaged homes, and/or students who are identified as being a student with a disability. Again often all of our the SWD's present at WLC have behaviors that impede their learning and/or the learning of others.
Measurable Outcome:	Students represented within the White Demographic will increase proficiency on the FSA ELA assessment by 5% with 75% achieving positive growth scores on the 2021 Spring FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Justin Browning (brownij2@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be involved in regular professional development from WLC mental health partner that will better equip them to work with students from low income homes, and trauma. In addition, teachers will attend professional development opportunities that teach close reading strategies to assist with students understanding and comprehension of text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need to be empathetic when working with the students at WLC who are from disadvantage homes and/or experienced trauma. These students have different needs than students whose basis needs are met and teachers will experience greater success if they are informed of the facts behind students from disadvantaged homes. Close reading strategies teach students how to interact with the text and be an active reader

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review Previous Years Data
2. Planning Professional Developments across year
3. Mental Health Agency Training Series
4. Close Reader Professional Development
5. Progress Monitoring of Student performance

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will use incentives to reward students for earning PBIS points and for making learning gains in reading. Dr. Wilkins will keep track of the teachers that are using PBIS consistently and rewarding students. These teachers will be recognized each month and will receive free lunch paid for by our SAC. PBIS will also aim to increase staff attendance on a weekly basis. Teachers that are present for 90+% of each month will be automatically entered into a drawing for a preferred item.

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.

We will create meaningful and productive parent involvement. We will set attainable goals for students and teachers. Last but not least, we will implement consistent discipline strategies across all grade groups.

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: ELA					\$34,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0294 - Willoughby Learning Center	Title, I Part A		\$34,000.00	
			Notes: Para to support reading comprehension				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities					\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged					\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: White					\$0.00
Total:							\$34,000.00