Wilkinson Junior High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wilkinson Junior High School

5025 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://wjh.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Nate Warmouth   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	59%
2021-22 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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 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:

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

Wilkinson Junior High School

5025 COUNTY ROAD 218, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://wjh.oneclay.net

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 7-8	No	59%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission is to instill in our scholars a desire for lifelong learning while providing positive experiences. Our scholars will be equipped with the knowledge, skills, resilience, and personal responsibility needed to face any challenge and be successful contributors to our global society. We believe it takes students, parents, faculty, staff, and our community partners working together to make this happen. By working together our scholars will soar to their highest levels of personal and academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe all children can learn.

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
Warmouth, Nathan	Principal	Evaluates ELA and Math, oversees all aspects of school
Stone, Cory	Dean	Assists in the handling of discipline, data, and PBIS
Carella, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Evaluates Science, Guidance, PE, Custodians. Assists in overseeing all aspects of the school
Moriarty, Micheala	Assistant Principal	Evaluates Social Studies, ESE, CTE, and Fine Arts. Assists in overseeing all aspects of the school
Burris, Sebrina	SAC Member	Review School Improvement Plan and Principal's Budget; support school-wide improvement goals
Pope, Mylan	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies teacher, department head, and building union rep
Ford , Linda	Teacher, ESE	ESE department head and support facilitator.
Smith, Shawn	SAC Member	Our community partnership school director.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Nate Warmouth

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

753

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

11

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

9

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	0	406	347	0	0	0	0	753
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	117	0	0	0	0	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	36	0	0	0	0	87
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	0	56	88	0	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	51	0	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	79	0	0	0	0	159

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	0	51	57	0	0	0	0	108

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

Friday 9/30/2022

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	0	376	382	0	0	0	0	758
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	19	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	27	0	0	0	0	44
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	0	55	79	0	0	0	0	134
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	77	0	0	0	0	128
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	15	0	0	0	0	32

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	41	72	0	0	0	0	113

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	3	7	0	0	0	0	10
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	0	376	382	0	0	0	0	758
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	19	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	27	0	0	0	0	44
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	0	55	79	0	0	0	0	134
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	77	0	0	0	0	128
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	15	0	0	0	0	32

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	41	72	0	0	0	0	113

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	3	7	0	0	0	0	10
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	44%	56%	50%				48%	61%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						49%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%						47%	49%	47%
Math Achievement	60%	33%	36%				63%	69%	58%
Math Learning Gains	58%						65%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						55%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	64%	53%				50%	66%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	59%	58%				74%	81%	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
07	2022					
	2019	48%	59%	-11%	52%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019	46%	63%	-17%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	46%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	50%	64%	-14%	48%	2%
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	74%	80%	-6%	71%	3%

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	92%	65%	27%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	64%	36%	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	20	28	24	31	46	44	23	54	33		
ELL	27	18		36	55						
BLK	40	35	27	53	50	50	50	81	73		
HSP	46	46	46	57	61	67	59	86	56		
MUL	50	48		50	56	70	63	88	36		
WHT	44	40	26	61	58	53	62	77	63		
FRL	38	38	24	50	56	53	49	69	46		

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	19	36	33	29	40	38	25	53	39		
BLK	40	43	31	38	46	62	46	71	44		
HSP	47	51	75	47	35	31	53	70	60		
MUL	64	60		63	47		76	82	67		
WHT	50	45	31	56	47	45	64	74	54		
FRL	44	45	43	40	40	40	56	66	41		

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	22	43	39	35	55	49	21	51	46		
BLK	45	57	50	52	76	71	34	76	67		
HSP	54	54	53	47	50	53	50	75	74		
MUL	38	53		56	53						
WHT	47	48	46	65	65	54	51	73	64		

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
FRL	44	47	43	59	63	50	44	68	67		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
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	58
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	58
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	54
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	47
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?

ELA- scores dropped. 7th grade 41% achievement levels, 8th grade 48% achievment levels
Math- overall this was collectively the most positive growth in all subjects: 7th Math; 41%, Pre-Alg; 59%, Alg; 92%, Geo; 97%

Science- rose from a 50% to a 62% acheivement levels. This was our single largest gain across all content

Civics- dropped 1% point from a 74% to a 73% achievement level

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

ELA- only 45% of students school wide are proficeint in ELA
41% 7th grade
48% 8th grade

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

Looking at the 21'-22' school year data, we decided that ELA needed to be an area of focus. School wide we were approximately 45% proficient in achievement levels. This needed to be a school wide priority to improve students ELA/reading skills. We are not certain on factors that led to low scores, as Civics, Science, and Math scores were much better. Typically if there is a drop off in ELA, other subjects follow. This was not the case for WJH.

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

8th grade Science scores rose from a 50% to a 62% achievement level. This was a single largest area of improvement.

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

Science is a tight knit group that worked hard within their PLC's. They also used dept PD and district PD to intentionally target areas of improvement.

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

We need to intentionally target our bubble and LQ students. For the 21'-22' school year, 45% of our students, in both 7th and 8th grade, were proficient in ELA achievement levels. ELA and reading are fundamental for all subjects, especially core courses. With 55% of our students not being proficient, this could potentially impact all subjects, grade levels, and tested areas. We have weekly Achieve 3000 articles used in our core subjects- all teachers are reading teachers. We will also use Lexia in intensive reading and ELA courses. There will also be school wide PD on reading strategies, including ACE (answer, cite, explain) and annotation strategies.

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.

Teacher/classroom walkthroughs, school PD, dept PD, every core subject has an achieve article per month. Also, district led PD focusing on B.E.S.T. standards and ELA coaching cycles with district ELA and reading coaches. School wide PD will focus on reading and writing strategies, including ACE strategy and annotation.

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

We also put our top level 2 students in intensive reading to assist in fine tuning ELA strategies in hopes those students can reach achievement levels

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.**	For the 21'-22' school year, 45% of our students, in both 7th and 8th grade, were proficent in ELA achievment levels. ELA and reading are fundamental for all subjects, especially core courses. With 55% of our students not being proficient, this could potentially impact all subjects, grade levels, and tested areas.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goals and expectations is that 7th grade improves from 41% to 51% in ELA achievment level. The 8th grdade students will rise from a 48% to a 55% achievement level.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Teacher/classroom walktroughs, school PD, dept PD, every core subject has an achieve article per month. Also, district led PDfocusing on B.E.S.T. standards and ELA coaching cycles with distrcit ELA and reading coaches. We also put our top level 2 students in intensie reading to assist in fine tuning ELA strategies in hopes those students can reach achiecment levels
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We will measure with lexile scores of Achieve. We will also be able to track the PM1 and PM2 to see areas of improvemtn and areas of opportunity prior to spring testing/PM3
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Looking at the 21'-22' school year data, we decided that ELA needed to be an area of focus. School wide we were approximately 45% proficient in achievement levels. This needed to be a school wide priority to improve students ELA/reading skills.

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.

Data will be used during PLC's to ensure students are on target with B.E.S.T. standards and are on pace with the Clay County ELA curriculum guides. Students will be exposed to grade level rigor based on the B.E.S.T. standards.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. 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.**	Our SWD and ELL population are below the federal index target of 41% (34% for both categories).
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By June of 2023 our SWD and ELL population will increase their scores to exceed the federal index target of 41%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	SWD and ELL students will be monitired through Achieve 3000 and Lexia programs, specifically their lexile scores. Additionally SWD and ELL support facilitators will push into Math and ELA classes to offer additional support and monitor the student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	SWD and ELL students were strategically placed in intensive reading classes for support as well as placed into ESE classes based their educational needs and supports. Using test data, IEP, and 504 documentation, the Florida Inclusion Network collaborated with WJH to intentionally schedule SWD and ELL students based off needs. WJH will use this to use a push in model strategy for inclusion classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	WJH and FIN used testing data, IEP, and 504 documents in order to determine the SWD and ELL student population needs. This data and documents allowed for WJH to creat inclusion classes and implement a push in model for additional supports.

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.

ESE teachers and support facilitators will push into inclusion classes that were strategically created to assist in supporting our SWD and ELL population.

Person Responsible   Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@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.

PBIS team and administration try to make the culture and climate of the school a postive experience. Students are given "Caught ya' Soarin" (mascot is an Eagle) cards. There is a small treat attached, but also they get to put their cards in the "Caught ya' Soarin" jar in the cafeteria. Each Friday we pull names out of the jar to spin the "Wheel of Fun." The wheel has prizes such as gift cards, snacks, school shirts, athletic passes, pool table usage, arcade, etc. There are campus wide Eagles of the Week each Friday- faculty, staff, and student. They all receive goodie bags, gift cards, and school spirit shirts. PBIS does a monthly treat for the facutly and staff- sometimes breakfast, lunch, candy, or drinks. Admin also does quarterly rewards for faculty and staff. For example, Friday cookouts, ice cream socials, treat carts, etc. Throughout the year there is also dress up weeks, school dances, faculty/staff holiday treats. There is also social media used to promote positive achiements by faculty/staff/students.

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

Admin and PBIS are resposnisble for all of the aforementioned items.