

Gulf County Schools

Wewahitchka Elementary School



2021-22 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Wewahitchka Elementary School

514 E RIVER RD, Wewahitchka, FL 32465

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer G UF Fey

Start Date for this Principal: 10/8/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2020-21 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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Gulf 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Wewahitchka Elementary School

514 E RIVER RD, Wewahitchka, FL 32465

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	14%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Gulf 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.

Wewahitchka Elementary School is preparing students today for the needs of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Wewahitchka Elementary School community is committed to providing children with academic direction and an environment conducive to attaining essential learning skills with cooperation, innovation, and discovery; contributing to the student's ability to make well-reasoned choices and to become responsible citizens today and in the future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Guffey, Jennifer	Principal	Leader of the School
Ludlam, Kimberley	Administrative Support	School-wide curriculum coordinator/support, principal designee
Bailey, Stephanie	School Counselor	Provides support to administrators, assists with data collection, and progress monitors and coordinates/provides support for student social and academic needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 10/8/2019, Jennifer G UF Fey

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

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

486

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	75	76	72	59	67	77	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	486
Attendance below 90 percent	9	24	18	14	14	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	13	27	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	26	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	1	2	2	3	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/20/2021

2020-21 - 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	69	69	55	63	79	62	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Attendance below 90 percent	2	6	3	10	12	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	69	69	55	63	79	62	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Attendance below 90 percent	2	6	3	10	12	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				46%	50%	57%	49%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	48%	58%	65%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	37%	53%	64%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	49%	63%	65%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	48%	62%	63%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	38%	51%	43%	33%	47%
Science Achievement				32%	46%	53%	44%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	42%	53%	-11%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	46%	-4%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	42%	-2%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
06	2021					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	42%	55%	-13%	62%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	39%	3%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2021					
	2019	62%	47%	15%	55%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	32%	46%	-14%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tool used to compile the below data for Wewahitchka Elementary School is i-ready.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7%	12%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6%	12%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	29%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2%	5%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	42%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9%	20%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32%	40%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	24%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	13%	14%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	27%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	21%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	20%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12	23	40	25	45	33					
BLK	15	20		14	30						
WHT	39	39	45	51	55	44	33				
FRL	26	33	35	35	52	33	12				
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	15	28	28	19	45	41	10				
BLK	11	25	29	4	17	25	8				
WHT	51	53	45	59	62	57	40				
FRL	42	46	37	50	54	49	33				
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	26	54	55	33	31	26	7				
BLK	24	61	73	41	52	25					
WHT	53	66	61	69	65	52	47				
FRL	42	66	64	62	62	37	33				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	279
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	44
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	32
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Math scores in grades 3-6 tend to run between 40-55% proficient. Lowest quartile students score in the C range for the past 4 years. However, most recent scores show 4th and 6th grades to be in the most need. Longitudinal data show 5th grade science to be consistently weak.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

4th and 6th Grades Math
5th Grade Science

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Recent school closures, recent faculty turnover

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

3rd grade Math

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Consistency of teachers, implementation of fidelity with curriculum and instruction

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Implementation of a pacing guide in mathematics; greater incorporation in hands on experiments in science, modifying schedule so teachers are teaching an area of personal strength

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Observation, modeling, structured feedback by Math Coach

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Greater data disaggregation to determine weaknesses in instruction and curriculum in 5th grade science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Florida Standards Assessment scores of 2021 showed a critical need in mathematics in both 4th and 6th grades scoring below 50% proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	WES plans to improve scores in both 4th and 6th grade mathematics to be above 50% proficiency.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through observation, implementation of pacing guides, progress monitoring, resources provided by District math coach.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	i-ready used for progress monitoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring through i-ready correlates with growth/proficiency on the Florida State Standards Assessment.
Action Steps to Implement	
Clear communication with teachers/District math coach/Principal	
Implementation of District math coach suggestions	
Observations/Walk-throughs	
Progress Monitoring	
The implementation of test specifications	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 5th Grade Science scores on the NGSSS showed a critical need scoring at 31% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: 5th grade students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency on the NGSSS.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through observations, modeling, progress monitoring by teachers and District data coach, input/collaboration with PAEC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Input from the District data coach that studies the data to assist with improving our 5th grade science scores.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Through the study of past science scores and looking at the weakest area, the District data coach is helping target specific needs to show improvement with ideas of tracking standards in lower grades and confirming the greatest needs in this area.

Action Steps to Implement

Clear communication with teachers/District data coach/Principal
 Implementation of District data coach suggestions
 Observations/Walk-throughs
 Progress Monitoring of standards and unit tests
 Supplemental instructional tools such as Generation Genius
 The implementation of test specifications

Person Responsible Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Florida Standards Assessment scores of 2021 showed a critical need in ELA of third grade students scoring below 50% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: Third grade students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency on the Florida Standards Assessment for the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through observations, modeling, progress monitoring by teachers, meetings with the Regional Literacy Director, Literacy walks, collaborative planning, input/collaboration with District Reading Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: i-ready for progress monitoring, new Benchmark Advance reading curriculum

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring through i-ready correlates with growth/proficiency on the Florida State Standards Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

Clear communication with teachers/District Reading Coach/Principal
 Monthly meetings with Literacy Leadership Team/Regional Literacy Director
 Observations/Literacy Walks
 Progress Monitoring
 Additional Reading Interventionist personnel to give interventions
 Accelerated Reader incentives for students
 i-ready class incentives
 Professional Development for teachers with new curriculum

Person Responsible Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

An area of concern with discipline is the number of suspensions out of school with our upper elementary aged students. A disciplinary action plan will be put into place for students with significant behavior concerns that lead to out of school suspensions.

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.

The school works to communicate with stakeholders at all levels to establish a safe and caring learning environment that develops characteristics of a positive attitude, respect, responsibility, self-control, and hard work ethics. All stakeholders involved within the school may reward students with positive office referrals that build upon the six attributes that WES places a focus on listed above.

The guidance counselor also works within classrooms to instruct a program called Safer, Smarter Kids to students that instills the qualities of good friendships and smart choices.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers, families, volunteers, guidance counselor, mental health counselor, Florida Department of Health in Gulf County (CHOICES Program), local youth pastor

Teachers and families work together to help the students become successful both academically and behaviorally.

Volunteers help promote activities within the school to build a positive climate/environment (book fair, PTO events).

The guidance counselor and mental health counselor work to incorporate and implement the programs to build character and life skills.

The representatives from the Florida Department of Health promote goal setting, self-esteem building, developing positive friendships, and avoiding unhealthy relationships.

Our local youth pastor makes random visits to build self-esteem and step in as a missing family member to encourage students at school activities.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00