

Nassau County School District

Wildlight Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Wildlight Elementary

550 CURIOSITY AVE, Yulee, FL 32097

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Amber Nicholas Bovinette

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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)	34%
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: A (65%) 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Nassau County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

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

Wildlight Elementary

550 CURIOSITY AVE, Yulee, FL 32097

[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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

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 Nassau 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.

The mission of Wildlight Elementary School is to embrace diversity and create a community of risk-taking, self-motivated learners who will reach their maximum potential academically, socially and developmentally in a safe and nurturing learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Wildlight Elementary is to allow all students to reach their maximum potential in all aspects of life by providing a safe learning environment, embracing diversity and creating a community of risk-taking, self-motivated learners.

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
Nicholas-Bovinetto, Amber	Principal	Coordinates administrative oversight and plans for all phases of instructional leadership for the school including educational programming, administration, budgetary planning, discipline, and counseling services.
McBee, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten representative
Hart, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	1st grade representative
Fancher, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade representative
Eliason, Jerri	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade representative
Druelle, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	5th grade representative
Ray, Sarah	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, SAC Chair Mentor
Faucher, Natalie	Reading Coach	Reading Coach, Data and Tutoring Lead
Hires, Erika	Teacher, ESE	ESE representative

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/15/2020, Amber Nicholas Bovinette

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,030

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

23

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

32

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	186	167	177	156	151	173	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1010
Attendance below 90 percent	21	18	25	16	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	3	4	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	4	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	18	0	1	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	6	4	2	13	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	3	2	1	2	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/11/2022

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	156	119	148	140	128	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840
Attendance below 90 percent	24	15	9	18	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	21	9	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	5	4	1	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	7	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	156	119	148	140	128	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840
Attendance below 90 percent	24	15	9	18	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	21	9	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	5	4	1	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	7	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	74%	69%	56%				74%	76%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						63%	65%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						54%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	79%	53%	50%				82%	85%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						75%	77%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						56%	67%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	81%	59%				76%	75%	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 Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	77%	75%	2%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	68%	4%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2022					
	2019	67%	75%	-8%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	82%	83%	-1%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	81%	-1%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					
	2019	82%	86%	-4%	60%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	76%	73%	3%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						

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	53	58	54	60	40	48	57				
BLK	63	67		58	55		56				
HSP	73	65		79	65		73				
MUL	76	69		77	71		38				
WHT	76	66	56	82	59	57	70				
FRL	66	63	55	70	54	48	48				
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	68	57		76	71	77	57				
BLK	75			86			73				
HSP	91			100							
MUL	72			71							
WHT	81	79	71	92	82	71	81				
FRL	73	55	50	83	76	56	65				
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	67	62	62	65	66	61	62				
BLK	68	68		68	59		73				
HSP	53			65							
MUL	50	40		75	80						
WHT	78	67	64	86	78	61	80				
FRL	65	57	45	73	75	53	61				

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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 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	60
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	71
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	66
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	67
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?

Across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas, WES is consistently at or above the State average (except one area is slightly lower). Data took a dip from the previous year's data, but still trending upward from data from years prior.

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

The greatest need for improvement is Math achievement and gains in ELA and Math for the lowest 25%.

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

Contributing factors include being in a high growth area with a heavy student transiency rate. Another factor is newer teachers and/or those new to the county who are learning the standards, test specs, and common best practices. New actions will be to observe how Daily Math is taught and identify specific best practices for ways that this will look at WES (i.e. student work expectations, how to review, etc.) New actions also to include work with new standards and new Math text to ensure beginning with the end in mind, and progress monitoring consistently with new progress monitoring tools provided by the state. New action will also include Math tutoring.

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

ELA showed the greatest area of achievement, exceeding District and State averages.

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

School Action Plans have been heavily rooted in ELA. Most observations, feedback, discussions, professional development, tutoring revolved around ELA, leading to greater achievement in this area than in Math/Science.

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

Strategies will include focus on the new standards and new curriculum in ELA and Math to ensure understanding of the standards and the tools for teaching them. Focus will also be on data analysis with new progress monitoring tools. The data will then drive the planning and instruction. We will continue to implement professional development in these areas, along with tutoring, targeted classroom learning walks, Mentoring Marigolds program for new teachers, oversight and feedback of the Saxon Phonics program, and continued professional development and observations for our paraprofessionals by the Reading Coach.

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.

Targeted classroom learning walks, revisiting learning goals and targets, utilizing the state's suggested tool for targeting standards with explicit, scaffolded, differentiated instruction, ensuring common language across the curriculums/subjects/instruction, continued support for the Leadership team as they lead their grade level teams, establishment of Literacy and Math teams to continue to build capacity for Leadership within the school, participation with District professional development, continued support with Saxon phonics, continued support with new standards, curriculum, and data analysis with new progress monitoring tools.

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

Recruiting and retaining high quality teachers is a high priority. Common planning will continue to be implemented to ensure sustainability, as well as established common academic language, as we continue to refine. Tightening planning routines will also assist with sustainability of improvement as we move from year to year, in addition to maintaining our District/School relationships with NEFEC and the DOE.

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 Math**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

Overall Math Achievement is identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Math achievement percentage points dropped 12% from 2021 to 2022, and Math Learning gains were below the state average. Math gains for the lowest 25% were equal to the state average, but below the District average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

WES will achieve at least 80% (or higher) in Math achievement for the 22-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Area of Focus will be monitored with targeted classroom walk-thrus and monitoring of implementation of professional development by Administration and Leadership Team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Consistent implementation of Daily Math with best practices will be used commonly across all grade levels, along with implementation of Math tutoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Daily Math is aligned to the standards and strategically spirals all of the standards throughout the school year. Although it is used across campus, use of this tool varies widely from class to class. The goal is to make implementation consistent, with a focus toward use of best practices in delivery and expectation of student work. Team will also set a schedule, expectations and strategies/ protocol for Math tutoring.

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.

Assemble a Math Committee (comprised of Math Planning Leads) on each grade level to provide a "train the trainer model" of professional development and review daily Math and develop school-wide, explicit expectations for implementation.

Person Responsible

Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Explicit standards walk-thrus will take place with Administration and Grade Level Chairs/Math Planning Team Leads to observe implementation of Daily Math and Math tutoring, look for common practices, best practices, and areas for continued tweaking and improvement.

Person Responsible Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Reflect with grade level team on practices for growth. Observe for implementation during Administrative walk-thrus, providing teacher modeling where needed, and continuing the cycle of professional development based on observed needs and data.

Person Responsible Sarah Ray (sarah.ray@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Leader in Me**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Leader in Me is a book study WES began six years ago. We continue to glean from this book and implement strategies to help raise the next generation of leaders. We believe all students can be leaders. An example area is use of school-wide data notebooks because a need was recognized for students to take ownership of their own data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of students at WES will have data notebooks, and will be able to articulate the data to their teacher and/or family.

Monitoring:

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

Data Notebooks will be monitored by the classroom teacher and Administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students owning their own data is a high effect strategy. Self-reported grades/student expectations has the highest effect size of 1.44.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

This strategy was selected by our teachers after understanding the tenants of the book, Leader in Me. Teachers know the students' data, but students don't often understand their data. Understanding their data gives them the power to set and achieve goals, arming them with strategies to become thinkers and leaders.

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.

Administration will lead a conversation with the Leadership Team regarding re-establishment of data notebooks and re-visioning the data notebooks based on relevant and updated data available.

Person Responsible

Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Each Grade Level Chair will work with their teams to assemble a mock data notebook, and bring it to the Leadership Team meeting to share out how their team built the notebook and rationale. Grade Chairs will collaborate with each other across grade levels to ensure that the data being collected is the most useful data and share ideas that could be adapted in other grade levels.

Person Responsible

Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Grade Level teams will implement data notebooks and/or data notebook revisions with their classes, and teach their students how to interpret, record their data, and how to set SMART goals. Students will be able to articulate their data and goals to their teacher and families. Students will work toward these long and short term goals, as they work toward standards mastery and "own" their data.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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.

Collaboration and an environment of trust with high expectations is established over time with through relationships and shared values & vision. Positive school culture also comes through PBIS, with the implementation of Skills Streaming, 7 Habits of Happy Kids, and school-wide implementation of Leader in Me. Faculty and Staff are celebrated for implementation of best practices and class achievement, as well as being honored throughout the year with various culture building luncheons and activities. Community involvement is also paramount and contributes to overall success and culture at WES.

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

Administration sets the tone and expectation and the structure for collaboration and trust to occur. It begins with Leadership. The faculty and staff have a role in recognizing and upholding each other, collaborating with each other for the betterment of our students and school, and offering ideas and suggestions for continuing to enhance positive school culture. The Community, including PTO offers services for all to partake in, such as special luncheons and recognitions. Our SAC Committee provides oversight of the implementation of our School Improvement Plan and always asks and follows through with ways to promote positive school culture and environment. WES celebrates with all of its stakeholders, as we move forward with raising our next generation of young citizens.