Clay County Schools

J.L. Wilkinson Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

J.L. Wilkinson Elementary School

4965 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://wes.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Carolyn Hayward

Start Date for this Principal: 4/1/2020

| 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (62%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | <u>Cassandra Brusca</u> |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo | or more information, <u>click here</u> . |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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:

- 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 | 10 |
| | |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Deguiremente | • |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |
| → •• | |

Last Modified: 4/29/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 26

J.L. Wilkinson Elementary School

4965 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://wes.oneclay.net

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2021-22 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | 2 Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S PK-6 | school | Yes | | 100% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 15% |
| School Grades Histo | ry | | | |
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
| Grade | В | | В | В |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

At Wilkinson Elementary, we provide high levels of learning for all students. We increase student achievement by having high standards and expectations in which students value and develop a drive, desire, and passion for learning. This is achieved by students being actively engaged in the learning process. By creating an optimal learning environment built on respect, safety and kindness, all students are achievers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wilkinson Elementary exists to provide a safe, caring and stimulating environment to prepare life long learners for success by assisting them in acquiring the necessary skills to achieve their fullest potential in a competitive global workplace.

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 |
|-------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Hayward, Carolyn | Principal | Instructional leader/supervisor of the school and all school activities |
| Hoffman, Kara | Assistant Principal | Leader of PBIS and staff professional development, head of discipline |
| Jones, LeAnne | Teacher, K-12 | Title I ELA, Title I compliance, Kindergarten team lead |
| Massey, Brian | Teacher, K-12 | Title I math and science |
| Amidon, Sara | Teacher, K-12 | Grade 1 Team Lead |
| Schloffman, Danielle | Teacher, K-12 | Grade 3 Team Lead |
| Adkison, Wendi | Teacher, K-12 | Grade 6 Team Lead |
| Anloague, Arnold | School Counselor | guidance and assessment |
| Wright, Kathryn | Teacher, K-12 | Resource Team Lead |
| Hinton, Taylor | Teacher, K-12 | Grade 6 teacher, SAC chair |
| Warren, Kelli | Teacher, K-12 | Grade 2 team lead |
| LaSauce, Joy | Teacher, K-12 | Grade 4 team lead |
| VanVactor, Alice | Teacher, K-12 | Title I ELA, ITF |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 4/1/2020, Carolyn Hayward

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.

3

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.

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

707

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

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

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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 87 | 81 | 93 | 91 | 83 | 92 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 616 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 | 29 | 23 | 29 | 27 | 30 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 19 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 12 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 21 | 30 | 16 | 21 | 8 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |

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 | | | | | | Gra | ade | Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|---|-----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | evel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/22/2022

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----|-----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 86 | 84 | 100 | 99 | 82 | 89 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 635 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 34 | 31 | 35 | 26 | 31 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | G | rade | Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| lu dia sta u | | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | | | | | | | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----|-----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 86 | 84 | 100 | 99 | 82 | 89 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 635 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 34 | 31 | 35 | 26 | 31 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| Indicator | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 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).

| Sahaal Crada Company | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | 2019 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | 52% | 63% | 56% | | | | 53% | 65% | 57% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | | | | | | 58% | 62% | 58% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 51% | | | | | | 59% | 54% | 53% | |
| Math Achievement | 63% | 51% | 50% | | | | 57% | 70% | 63% | |
| Math Learning Gains | 67% | | | | | | 56% | 66% | 62% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | | | | | | 40% | 56% | 51% | |
| Science Achievement | 55% | 69% | 59% | | | | 58% | 65% | 53% | |

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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | mparison | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | mparison | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 68% | -21% | 58% | -11% |
| Cohort Cor | mparison | 0% | | | • | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 64% | -17% | 58% | -11% |
| Cohort Cor | mparison | -47% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 62% | -7% | 56% | -1% |
| Cohort Cor | mparison | -47% | | | <u>'</u> | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 64% | -4% | 54% | 6% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -55% | | | · ' | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0% | | | ' | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 71% | -16% | 62% | -7% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 69% | -13% | 64% | -8% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -55% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 64% | -14% | 60% | -10% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -56% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 70% | -8% | 55% | 7% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -50% | ' | | <u>'</u> | |

| | | | SCIEN | CE | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| | | | SCIENC | CE | | |
|------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 57% | 63% | -6% | 53% | 4% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Con | Cohort Comparison | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2022 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 31 | 46 | 42 | 43 | 54 | 56 | 39 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 50 | | 50 | 71 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | | | 57 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 55 | 51 | 64 | 68 | 67 | 57 | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 53 | 52 | 60 | 67 | 70 | 47 | | | | |
| | | 2021 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 37 | 57 | 65 | 42 | 48 | 46 | 25 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | | | 53 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 57 | 62 | 57 | 52 | 39 | 47 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 53 | 52 | 50 | 48 | 41 | 38 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 34 | 44 | 50 | 38 | 50 | 40 | 44 | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | 54 | | 55 | 31 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 58 | 58 | 57 | 57 | 40 | 57 | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 57 | 64 | 54 | 51 | 38 | 56 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|----------------------|
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 411 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 44 |
| 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 | |
| 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 Consequitive Veers Native American Students Subgroup Bolow 229/ | 0 |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | U |
| Asian Students | 0 |
| | 0 |
| Asian Students | N/A |
| Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | N/A |
| Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% Black/African American Students | N/A |
| Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% Black/African American Students Federal Index - Black/African American Students | N/A 0 |
| Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% Black/African American Students Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A 0 |
| Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% Black/African American Students Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | N/A 0 |
| Asian Students Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% Black/African American Students Federal Index - Black/African American Students Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students | N/A 0 N/A 0 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 61 |
| 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 | 59 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| | 57 |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 01 |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

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?

Emerging trends for ELA indicate a slight increase (2%) in overall proficiency from last year (52% proficient this year, 50% proficient in 20-21), with a decrease (2%) in learning gains over the last 3 years (21/22-56%, 20/21-57%, 20/19-no data, 19/18-58%), and a 4 year decrease (19%) in learning gains of the lowest quartile (21/22-51%, 20/21-60%, 20/19-no data, 18/19-59%, 17/18-70%). Trends for math are shorter term, but suggest notable gains in achievement (6%) and learning gains (13%), and significant gains of the lowest quartile (27%). Science is trending upward (7%) again after a significant drop in 2021.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, the areas of greatest opportunity are ELA and science with ELA proficiency at 52% and Science proficiency at 55%.

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

A factor which contributed to this need for improvement in all content areas was the Covid 19 pandemic which continued to present problems of inconsistent attendance and increased the need for remediation. Additionally, our scholars tend to lack core foundational skills in the area of reading which impedes the progress of all content. Our teachers have embraced the supplemental programs provided by the district last year (Heggerty, From Phonics to Reading) and we are beginning to experience an appreciable gain in the lower grades. For scholars in grades 3-6, we will need to address the deficits in decoding through the implementation of targeted small groups. We will expand the use of PENDA to grade 3 to support science instruction. Content area professional learning communities will disaggregate data to improve teaching and increase student achievement.

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

Mathematics achievement saw a 6% gain overall, with math learning gains at +14%, and math lower quartile gains at +27%.

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

We can contribute much of our learning gains in math to a schoolwide math fact fluency initiative in which scholars were assessed weekly on grade-level facts and were rewarded for achieving and maintaining their goals.

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

Acceleration of student learning begins with deepening educator knowledge and practice. We will continue to utilize both district and school based specialists and coaches, as well as other instructional leaders to do this.

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.

Professional development opportunities for ELA will include Savvas, Heggerty, From Phonics to Reading, SRA Decoding, Wilson, Kid Lips, Spelling Mastery; for Science PENDA, and the Nature of Science; for PBIS how to increase parental involvement, Poverty and its effects upon our scholars, and Understanding PBIS.

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

Additional services ensuring sustainability or improvement include district support through coaches and specialists, Title I personnel and services, coordination and integration of services from other departments such as ESE, preschool, and extended day learning opportunities.

Areas of Focus

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

•

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

A strategic focus will be placed on achieving an increase in overall reading proficiency schoolwide. Current data indicates that 52% of scholars are proficient in ELA. An increase in this area will close the achievement gap in reading and will translate across curriculums, affecting an increase in achievement in other content areas.

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our overall proficiency in reading comprehension from 52% to 57% as measured by the FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will be FAST, in addition to Savvas and Lexia Core diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Small group instruction (SRA Decoding)

Instructional scaffolding (Achieve, SRA Decoding, targeted skills, etc.) Evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 components of reading (Lexia)

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

Explicit and systematic phonological awareness and phonemic awareness instruction (Heggerty, From Phonics to Reading, Kid Lips, etc)
Explicit vocabulary instruction (Zaner Bloser Vocabulary)
Explicit comprehension instruction (SRA Comprehension)

Progress monitoring (FAST) Universal screening (FAST, Lexia)

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

According to their ESSA ratings, there is strong evidence to to support the lasting effects of these strategies.

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.

Strategic use of instructional coaches from Title I, as well as district coaches and specialists, working alongside classroom teachers to support reading comprehension.

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Targeted intervention groups utilizing evidence-based strategies and tools for instruction (SIPPS, PALS, Heggerty, Wilson, SRA Corrective Reading, Spelling Mastery) as student need requires

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

PLCs and quarterly data meetings to inform instruction through analysis, assessment and student work

Person Responsible Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

60 minute ELA intervention block supported by Title I coaches and paraprofessionals

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Use of Social Studies Weekly informational text

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Use of Simple Rigor strategies with Achieve articles.

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Purchase of technology to support instruction and assessment

Person Responsible Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

Extended day and/or summer reading camp

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Use of Kid Lips supplemental materials in K and 1

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

ESE teachers will receive training in Decoding Strategies so they can implement the program with their

scholars.

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description

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

The specific area of instructional focus will be increasing science proficiency. Current data indicates that our proficiency in science is 55%. An increase in this area will close the achievement gps in science content, as well as broaden science inquiry knowledge and scientific discourse.

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

Using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our overall proficiency in the nature of science from 55% to 60% by the end of the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring for grades K-3 will be done with a teacher created assessment. Grades 4-6 will be monitored using the Synergy Science assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidencebased strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Inquiry based lessons using the 5E instructional planning

Small group instruction (need based)

Instructional scaffolding (PENDA, Generation Genius)

Progress monitoring (HMH, teacher created, PENDA, and Synergy)

Explicitly teach vocabulary (best practices)

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The strategies were selected because there is strong evidence to support the long term efficacy. The National Research Council (2000) reveals that "a classroom in which students use scientific inquiry to learn is one that resembles those that research has found as being the most effective for learning for understanding" (p. 124).

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.

Resource teachers will focus on scientific concepts as they relate to their content areas.

Person Responsible Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

Title I funded teacher for class size reduction

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Scholars in grades 3-6 will use PENDA instructional technology.

Person Responsible Brian Massey (brian.massey@myoneclay.net)

Instructional coaching for targeted individuals (Title I and district)

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Strategic intervention groups utilizing evidence based strategies and tools for instruction

Person Responsible Brian Massey (brian.massey@myoneclay.net)

Data driven PLCs and quarterly data meetings to inform instruction by analysis of assessment and student work

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Use of Science Weekly to support learning K-5

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Use of Generation Genius science software in STEM resource

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Use of science related informational text and Achieve articles

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

ESE teachers will collaborate with science teachers in PLC to analyze performance of their scholars and

evaluate interventions required.

Person Responsible Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

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

A specific effort to reduce absences will increase instructional time on task. Current data indicates that school wide attendance for last year was 92% An increase in attendance will increase proficiency across all curriculums and assist in closing achievement gaps.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase our overall attendance from 92% to 95% by the end of the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will record scholar attendance daily utilizing the Synergy online platform. Along with the classroom teachers, the school secretary will monitor absences regularly following the decision tree for actions needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. To impact student attendance, it is important to develop a school culture promoting a sense of safety, respect, and personal responsibility where students feel connected to their school.

Design a safe environment (PBIS, 7 Mindsets)
Establish positive connections (PBIS, Wildcat 200)
Develop predictable routines (PBIS, Wildcat 200)

Define and teach positive expectations (PBIS, Wildcat 200)

Plan relevant instruction (PBIS, 7 Mindsets)

Create and provide a continuum of response strategies (PBIS)

Monitor student outcomes (PBIS, Wildcat 200)

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

In Chronic Absenteeism in the Nation's Schools (2019), the Department of Education notes that students who are chronically absent--meaning they miss at least 15 days a school in a year--are at serious risk of falling behind in school. Additionally, chronic absenteeism may prevent children from reaching early milestones, and may be a better predictor of whether students will drop out of school than test scores. Research indicates that the strategies we have selected have a high correlation to positive outcomes.

used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Utilize S'More to inform parents and families of school attendance initiatives

Person Responsible

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Schoolwide use of PBIS program

Person

Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

Responsible

Responsible

Schoolwide Wildcat 200 program

Person

Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

Schoolwide use of the Seven Mindsets curriculum (Teaching Students from Poverty)

Person

Responsible

Kara Hoffman (kara.hoffman@myoneclay.net)

Attendance calls and letters/unexcused absences decision tree

Person

Responsible

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

Utilize services of school social worker to assist with reaching out to families and Student Services Team

Person

Responsible

Carolyn Hayward (carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
 Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on EOY Lexia data.

K- Everyone is on or above grade level

1- 10% below grade level

2 - 29.2% below grade level

Data from FAST PM reflects the following are not on track to score a Level 3 or above:

K - 48%

Grade 1 - 52%

Grade 2 - 53%

Lexia Core BOY average level:

K - L1

Grade 1 - L6

Grade 2 - L8

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on FSA data:

Grade 3 - 56% below Level 3

Grade 5 - 52% below Level 3

Students identified with substantial reading deficiency due to scoring a Level 1 on FSA:

Grade 3 - 4%

Grade 4 - 26%

Grade 5 - 18%

Data from the FAST PM 1 reflects the following are not on track to score a Level 3 or above:

Grade 3 - 83%

Grade 4 - 81%

Grade 5 - 69%

The greatest area of opportunity across all grades in Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary Performance.

Lexia Core BOY average level:

Grade 3 - L10 Grade 4 - L13

Grade 5 - L15

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Kindergarten - PM 1 STAR data indicates that 48% are not on track to score a Level 3 or above. Our goal is to reduce this number to no more than 25% by the end of the 2022-23 school year.

Grade 1 - PM 1 STAR data indicates that 52% are not on track to score a Level 3 or above. Our goal is to reduce this number to no more than 25% by the end of the 2022-23 school year.

Grade 2 - PM 1 STAR data indicates that 53% are not on track to score a Level 3. Our goal is to reduce this number to no more than 30% by the end of the 2022-23 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on EOY FSA 21-22 data:

- 3 Starting at 56% below Level 3, goal is to reduce to 48% below Level 3 by the end of the 2022-23 school year.
- 5 Starting at 52% below Level 3, goal is to reduce to 45% below Level 3 by the end of the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Quarterly data meetings with all faculty and RAISE team including District Reading Specialists where all data sources including FAST progress monitoring, Lexia Core, Savvas, intervention are reviewed to determine their effect upon our desired outcomes. As needed, scholars may be evaluated for different and/or additional interventions. ELA PLCs will meet weekly to review/revise instruction. Observational data from administrator and/or district content coaches/specialists, including district calibration walks will be used monitor progress The Literacy Leadership Team will meet regularly to oversee and monitor instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidencebased Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

In accordance with the District's CERP and the B.E.S.T. standards, the following evidence-based practices/ programs will be implemented to achieve the anticipated outcomes.

90 minute of daily, uninterrupted, tier 1 core instruction SAVVAS

Lexia Core5, K-5

Heggerty, grades K-2

From Phonics to Reading, grades K-3

Kid Lips grades K-1

Achieve3000, grades 3-5

PALS, K-2 tier 2

Spelling Mastery grades 3-5 tier 2

Spelling Through Morphology grades 3-6 tier 2

SIPPS grades 1-2 tier 2.

SRA Decoding/Corrective Reading grades 3-6 tier 3.

The Wilson Reading System, grades 3-5 tier 3

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidence-based practices and programs above were selected in accordance with the district CERP and because they have demonstrated statistically significant positive effect on student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

90 minute of daily, uninterrupted, tier 1 core instruction SAVVAS, with supplemental supports: Lexia Core5, Heggerty Phonemic Awareness, From Phonics to Reading, Kid Lips, Achieve3000.

With guidance and support from the Literacy Leadership Team and school/district literacy coaches, ELA teachers will provide 90 minutes of differentiated instruction including flexible teacher-led groups, independent student centers, and whole group instruction. Data from all assessment opportunities including FAST, Lexia, SAVVAS, other diagnostics, as well as teacher created tools and observation will be analyzed to ensure progress toward expected outcomes. Professional Learning opportunities will be provided in the following areas: Google tools, Checks for Understanding, Science of Reading, Lid Lips and others, as needed.

Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.net

Students who exhibit a substantial deficiency in reading based upon screening, diagnostic, progress monitoring or assessment data, statewide assessments or teacher observations will be provided intensive, explicit, systematic and multisensory reading interventions: PALS, Spelling Mastery, Spelling Through Morphology, SIPPS, Corrective Reading, The Wilson System.

With guidance and support of the Literacy Leadership Team and school/district literacy coaches, ELA teachers will utilize the 60 minute intervention block to provide intensive intervention for any scholar requiring it. Progress monitoring will be done at regular intervals to determine the effectiveness of the interventions. Professional Learning opportunities will be determined based upon the program(s) required by student need and the educator's level of knowledge. (Corrective Reading, Wilson, etc.)

Hayward, Carolyn, carolyn.hayward@myoneclay.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.

Wilkinson Elementary is a PBIS model school, honored to receive the bronze award for the 2021-22 school year. We seek to create and maintain a learning environment which fosters student success. In doing so, we believe that we are carrying out our vision statement: Wilkinson Elementary exists to provide a safe, caring and stimulating environment to prepare lifelong learners for success by assisting them in acquiring the necessary skills to achieve their fullest potential in a competitive global workplace. This is accomplished in many ways, including positive office referrals, schoolwide Wildcat 200 program in which scholars are recognized for outstanding demonstration of the Wildcat Guidelines for Success with a positive phone call to a parent by administration, a PBIS committee which meets monthly to assess behavioral trends and

needs, the creation of a Behavior Intervention Form and discipline flow chart, and a Sixth Grade Leadership Team nominated by their peers, teachers, and administrators. Additionally, we pursue an active presence on social media platforms highlighting the achievements and undertakings of our scholars and our staff. We know that regular attendance is one of the greatest predictors of success in school; therefore, we have chosen to focus on improving attendance by using the above initiatives to make our school a place our scholars and their families wish to be. Families are frequently provided with information regarding the importance of attendance, and scholars are routinely rewarded for good attendance. We aim to create a positive school culture by building relationships not only with our scholars, but also with their families and caretakers. We have planned many parent and family engagement events which enable us to interact with our entire school community which is mutually rewarding for our families and our staff. The building of a positive school environment also extends to our staff who enjoy recognitions for teacher, support, and bus driver of the month. Nominations for these staff-selected awards are read over the morning announcements daily, providing affirmation and encouragement to all. Our Hospitality Committee also plans monthly treats and snack carts helping to make WES the best place on the planet to help scholars learn and grow!

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

The stakeholders of Wilkinson Elementary include our family members, community and school staff. As a Title I school, we know that it truly does take a village to educate a child, and we welcome the contributions of all stakeholders. Some of these comprise our School Advisory Council which meets at least quarterly to provide input for school-based decisions, parent activities, and Title I requirements such as the Parent and Family Engagement Plan and School Improvement Plan. Members carefully consider the needs of the school and attempt to address potential barriers to participation so that families are encouraged to attend all applicable events. Family members also serve as volunteers, supporting our scholars and staff in a variety of ways such as chaperoning field trips, assisting with special projects and helping in the classrooms. We are fortunate to partner with a few of our local churches whose members have taken a special interest in supporting our staff as well as providing donations of supplies and other items to our scholars and their families. Staff members promote a positive culture and environment by implementing various PBIS initiatives and educating about the Wildcat Guidelines for Success which are to be respectful, kind, honest and responsible, and by recognizing scholars who demonstrate these traits. Kindergarten and Title I teachers partner with our local and on-site preschool programs to create a smooth transition to school by updating them with information regarding kindergarten registration and by hosting KinderCamp, whereby entering scholars and their families have an opportunity to meet the kindergarten teachers and receive take home materials to start their year off on a positive note. Likewise, we also partner with our neighboring junior high school to provide transitional activities for our 6th grade scholars. Working together, all stakeholders strive to help our scholars reach their full potential in a safe, welcoming and positive environment.