

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Wilson Middle School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (71%) 2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (75%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	26%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fantauzzo, Keith	Principal	Coordinate the completion of the SIP, represent admin at SAC meetings, continually monitor SAP and make adjustments as needed.
Batista, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Assist in the completion of the SIP, represent admin at SAC meetings in the absence of the principal, continually monitor SAP and make adjustments as needed.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 1/27/2020, Keith Fantauzzo

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

29

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

620

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

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

## Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	204	216	195	0	0	0	0	615
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	15	24	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	24	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	22	20	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	15	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	3	5	0	0	0	0	9

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/31/2022

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	218	192	210	0	0	0	0	620	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	17	0	0	0	0	46	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	0	0	0	0	25	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	10	0	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	21	0	0	0	0	48	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	218	192	210	0	0	0	0	620	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	17	0	0	0	0	46	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	0	0	0	0	25	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	10	0	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	21	0	0	0	0	48	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4

#### 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	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	76%	50%	50%				79%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						63%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						54%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	80%	36%	36%				84%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	75%						71%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						65%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	52%	53%				74%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	89%	58%	58%				93%	67%	72%

### 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
06	2022					
	2019	76%	53%	23%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	83%	54%	29%	52%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
08	2022					
	2019	76%	53%	23%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	70%	49%	21%	55%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	93%	62%	31%	54%	39%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
08	2022					
	2019	38%	31%	7%	46%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	74%	47%	27%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	67%	27%	71%	23%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	97%	63%	34%	61%	36%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

## Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	32	35	35	37	49	24		59	58		
ELL	48	52	44	52	64	56	55	60	64		
ASN	88	76		94	94				100		
BLK	45	42	42	44	62	70	35	73	82		
HSP	71	56	42	68	69	59	69	92	77		
MUL	76	53		84	78	67		79	100		
WHT	80	55	40	86	77	52	76	91	88		
FRL	57	46	42	60	66	57	46	78	72		
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	25	41	34	29	46	47	21	33	50		
ELL	46	58	55	39	47	32		71			
ASN	88	79		82	57						
BLK	39	43	42	31	32	20		60			
HSP	66	58	51	61	58	38	53	70	85		
MUL	78	75		68	64						
WHT	77	66	35	82	67	52	71	91	88		
FRL	54	57	48	51	52	34	47	65	76		
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		

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	694
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
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	67
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	77
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	72
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### 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?

Although we increased in the area of achievement across all subject areas, we decreased in the area of English/Language Arts Learning Gains by 8 percentage points and only were able to maintain at 42% in the area of English/Language Arts Lowest 25th Percentile

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

English/Language Arts Learning Gains and English/Language Arts Lowest 25th Percentile

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

Our focus last year in part was on increasing or maintaining the achievement of our higher level students. Our focus this year will be on our lower level Reading classes and on the differentiation in teaching for our lower level readers in their Language Arts classes

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Math, pretty much across the board showed vast improvement. Overall Math Achievement rose 7%; Math Learning Gains showed a 12% increase; and our Lowest 25th percentile in Math went up 16%

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

The collaboration between Math teachers within each grade level and among the Math teachers across all three grade levels was the best it's ever been since I've been at Wilson. The teachers worked together for the benefit of all students. Our largest gains came from our 6th grade Math students. Wilson's 6th grade Math students earned the second highest achievement level in entire district with 82% of students showing proficiency

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

We will focus on Teacher Led Small Groups. This strategy involves the continuous assessment of students using formal and informal assessments, allowing the teacher to pull students of similar levels into small groups and working with them individually on exactly what they need

**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.**

All teachers on our campus have had training in the area of Teacher Led Small Groups. I will poll the faculty at the beginning of the school year to see what additional training they need in this area (if any). Included in this survey to the teachers will be questions on what they would like Professional Development on.

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

- Continuous monitoring of practice and adjust as needed
- Extended Learning Program for grade enhancement and tutoring
- Student Services team will refresh the staff as needed on the RTI process

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Deliberate focus on our bottom quartile learners – Teachers will progress monitor students throughout the year and within each lesson to identify learning gaps and will utilize Teacher Led Small Group instruction to work with students based on their individual needs

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

We will see an increase in at least 4 percentage points in both or English Language Arts and Math Bottom Quartile percentages

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Teachers will use Baseline data at the beginning of the school year and assess within each lesson to determine where their students are within the content and will use this data to differentiate instruction within their content.  
 Teachers will utilize Teacher Led Small Group instruction as one tool to achieve this goal

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amanda Batista (amanda.batista@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Teacher Led Small Group Instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Aligns with the District Instructional Priorities and allows room for "filling in the gaps" for our students

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Through District PD and ILT/Lead Team Meetings, faculty meetings, Administration will ensure all staff members understand how to implement Through District PD and ILT/Lead Team Meetings, faculty meetings, Administration will ensure all staff members understand how to implement Teacher Led Small Group Instruction
- PD will be determined by need based on data provided by the needs assessment survey and discussed in ILT/Lead Team meetings

**Person Responsible**

Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)



## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Differentiation within the classroom – Across all lines of differences, students will have access to grade appropriate instruction

### Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will see an increase in at least 4 percentage points in both or English Language Arts and Math Bottom Quartile percentages

### Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Teachers will use Baseline data at the beginning of the school year and assess within each lesson to determine where their students are within the content and will use this data to differentiate instruction within their content.  
Teachers will utilize Teacher Led Small Group instruction as one tool to achieve this goal

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Batista (amanda.batista@hcps.net)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Professional development will be offered throughout the school year addressing differentiation in the classroom. We will offer "Model Classrooms," Professional Development by District personnel as needed for teachers and/Administration on and off-site.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Aligns with the District Instructional Priorities and allows room for "filling in the gaps" for our students,

### Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Through District PD and ILT/Lead Team Meetings, faculty meetings, Administration will ensure all staff members understand how to implement the Acceleration vs. Remediation strategy.

PD will be determined by need based on data provided and discussed in ILT/Lead Team meetings.

### Person Responsible

Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Wilson's Student Services team leads the charge regarding school culture. When stakeholders know their role regarding all aspects of their job, student learning is positively impacted. This begins with the RTI process. The Student Services team trains the staff regarding the RTI process and what role each plays in it. Additionally, Student Services coordinates schoolwide projects like "Bulldogs Don't Bully", "Start With Hello", "See Something, Say Something", and classroom guidance throughout the year to include "Act Now" and other topics we see needed during the year. With the PTSA, Student Services also coordinates "Parent Pep Talks". These sessions are for parents and include topics such as student anxiety, vaping, eating disorders, and much more.

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

- Administration- Oversees all aspects of projects/policies to promote a positive school culture
- Counselors, School Psych and Social Worker- Develop and implement different events and activities throughout the year to promote a positive culture and environment
- Teachers- Participate and encourage students to participate in the events/activities along with promoting a positive classroom culture each day
- Parents/Families- Play an active role regarding their child's school experience, asking them questions and encouraging their participation in activities/events
- Local Businesses - There recently has been an uptick of vandalism and other incidents involving Wilson students in and around the Hyde Park Village. We are working closely with business owners and authorities to help identify and contact parents of students involved to help curb this behavior