

Lake Wales Charter Schools

Janie Howard Wilson School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Janie Howard Wilson School

306 FLORIDA AVE, Lake Wales, FL 33853

<http://lwcharterschools.com/janiehoward>

Demographics

Principal: Linda Ray

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2017

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to provide a safe and caring environment where all students can be prepared both socially and academically for our future society. Learning for all, whatever it takes!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Janie Howard Wilson's (JHW) vision is to provide a happy, caring, and stimulating environment where children can achieve their fullest potential. The JHW staff works together to provide a safe, nurturing learning environment that fosters curiosity, inquiry, and appreciation for life-long learning. We collectively work in partnership with parents, community, and all stakeholders to educate our students and prepare them to be productive citizens in the world of work. Learning for all: Whatever it takes!

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ray, Linda	Principal	To provide a positive working environment and hire highly qualified and certified instructors.
Griffiths, Kim	Assistant Principal	To maintain the operation of the school, curriculum, and promote and follow the vision of the principal.
Borders, Elizabeth	Teacher, ESE	ESE Referral Coordinator; ESOL Lead Teacher
Finnell, Deann	Instructional Coach	Title One Teacher, PTO, Reading Resource, Tier 3 Reading Endorsed Teachers
Gunn, Genifer	Instructional Coach	Math Instructional Coach, A-Team Coach, and extra curricular lead teacher
Grondin, Hillary	Instructional Coach	Interventionist for Tier 3 Reading for grades K-5

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/20/2017, Linda Ray

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

390

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

16

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

18

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	77	58	69	67	58	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387
Attendance below 90 percent	33	27	26	23	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	7	4	12	5	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	2	1	5	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	12	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	13	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	13	21	30	28	12	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	13	21	30	28	12	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	14	11	14	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	3	1	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 12/1/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	80	57	60	60	58	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	374
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	10	7	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	7	4	8	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	20	8	9	7	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in Math	7	8	9	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	10	9	10	8	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	20	8	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	80	57	60	60	58	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	374	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	10	7	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	
One or more suspensions	7	4	8	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in ELA	20	8	9	7	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	
Course failure in Math	7	8	9	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	

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	10	9	10	8	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	20	8	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%			44%		57%	43%		56%
ELA Learning Gains	42%			47%		58%	43%		55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%			50%		53%	43%		48%
Math Achievement	47%			54%		63%	53%		62%
Math Learning Gains	39%			59%		62%	59%		59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	6%			56%		51%	43%		47%
Science Achievement	26%			30%		53%	40%		55%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Janie Howard Wilson Elementary utilizes the NWEA Maps for reading and mathematics.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%		
	Students With Disabilities	0%		
	English Language Learners	1%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%		
	Students With Disabilities	0%		
	English Language Learners	1%		
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%		
	Students With Disabilities	13%		
	English Language Learners	2%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%		
	Students With Disabilities	13%		
	English Language Learners	9%		

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%		
	Students With Disabilities	10%		
	English Language Learners	1%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%		
	Students With Disabilities	5%		
	English Language Learners	30%		
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%		
	Students With Disabilities	11%		
	English Language Learners	0%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	41%		
	Students With Disabilities	33%		
	English Language Learners	1%		

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%		
	Students With Disabilities	5%		
	English Language Learners	0%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%		
	Students With Disabilities	11%		
	English Language Learners	25%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	26%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%		
	Students With Disabilities	11%		
	English Language Learners	33%		

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11	8		36	31		8				
ELL	42	38		68	62		50				
BLK	27	31		34	12						
HSP	43	43		54	45		37				
WHT	44	50		54	56		32				
FRL	38	40	57	46	36	7	25				
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	31	38		41	52	46	50				
ELL	44	36		53	65	55	27				
BLK	35	47	38	50	68		27				
HSP	48	42	60	54	56	47	25				

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
WHT	46	50	50	58	55		47				
FRL	42	41	52	51	57	56	24				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	37		28	40	18					
ELL	68	58		70	65						
BLK	25	25	38	54	60	62	25				
HSP	57	52		59	64		47				
WHT	44	53	50	46	50	18	47				
FRL	41	42	46	54	60	44	37				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	312
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	21
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	47
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

After reviewing the data, Janie Howard Wilson Elementary has continued to decline and decrease in almost all categories since 2018. These categories include the following:

- Proficiency with Reading, Math, and Science
- Learning Gains with Reading and Math
- Bottom Quartile Learning with Reading and Math
- Subgroups with Students with Disabilities (SWD), African Americans, and Economically Disadvantaged have now decreased below the 41% expectation with Every Student Succeeds Act. Our progress monitoring data for the 2021-2022 school year shows that this trend has not improved. The progress monitoring data indicates we have a significant Tier 1 concern across all grade levels as there is a small population meeting the expectations for the beginning of the year benchmarks associated with our progress monitoring.

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

The greatest need for improvement needs to be an increase with our reading and science proficiency. There was also a sharp decline with our math learning gains with a specific focus with our bottom quartile.

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

The contributing factors to this need is high absenteeism, tardiness, and leaving school early. There was a large number of students who chose online learning and did not have high participation in our intermediate grades. Also, we had our fourth grade teachers teach math for the first time last year during the transition from Covid. Our school also has a high mobility rate with students entering and withdrawing.

There is a lack of tier 1 materials for math and there was no math coach for the 2019-2021 school years. This had a large impact with the fidelity of teaching the standards and tracking the progress of the standards. In reading, there was also a lack of the tier 1 materials. The multitiered support system (MTSS) was not implemented with fidelity.

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

The only data component that showed no learning loss was the bottom quartile for reading on the FSA this past year. This is not being indicated to be on track with this school year with the beginning of the year progress monitoring.

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

The contributing factors for the bottom quartile to not show a learning loss was having a reading coach on campus, experienced teachers with the upper grades, and the use of the accelerated reading and station programs. The teachers also implemented small groups and novel studies.

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

The strategies that will need to implement in order to accelerate learning this year will be the following:

- Tier 3 with reading interventionist and/or reading endorsed teachers
- Fidelity with the tier 3 program: Ispire and Sound Sensile
- Fidelity of tier 2 and meeting every six weeks to data check with the MTSS program
- The addition of a media specialist to increase book checkout and AR participation. There is also the increase of the number of books added to the media center.
- Credit recovery program at home beginning in January
- New reading curriculum schoolwide to build a comprehensive program
- Professional development with the state regional directors to guide us with the reading standards
- Collaborative planning meetings weekly with the staff members and monthly within our system to develop common practices.
- Increasing the number of reading endorsed teachers and ESOL endorsed teachers at our school.
- Math coach was hired for the 2021-2022 school year
- Implementation of having art/music teachers to provide a well rounded student
- Hired a full time social worker
- Have a comprehensive ESE program by adding a resource room

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.

The contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, the following professional development opportunities were provided to support teachers and leaders:

- Monthly coaches meetings for math and reading with our other schools
- Stemscopes training for science
- Rocket Math for Math Fluency
- Reading Wonders Training
- Istation Training
- ISpire Training
- Sound Sensible
- Mental Health Training / Cloud 9
- Acaletics Training
- Enrich Training
- Word Wall Training
- Leadership team to do PYP/IB training
- Weekly Collaborative Planning
- Ongoing Reading Endorsement Training for Teachers

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

Reading Wonders, new standards training, continuation of weekly collaborative planning, continuation of reading endorsements, teacher certification for non-certified teachers, Accelerated Reading

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Due to the new standards, there is a need for professional development to provide a deep understanding of expectations. There is also a need for professional development for the new reading curriculum (Wonders), and there is a need for MTSS training. To ensure all professional development is being implemented with fidelity, the leadership team meets with the teachers each week.

To increase a print environment around the campus, the reading coach will be monitoring the use of Word Walls and the use of student work as new bulletin boards were installed around the campus.

Measureable Outcome:

Our goal would be to have 95% participation with all professional developments on our campus that relates to the standards and our curriculum Wonders.

We will continue to monitor the implementation and fidelity of MTSS with reading and the tier 3 reading programs to ensure there is an increase of proficiency and learning gains.

Monitoring:

This area of focus will be monitored with attendance documented for each training and collaborative meetings. The use of MTSS programs will be documented in lesson plans and the use of Word Walls will be observed during observations and walk throughs with the reading coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Griffiths (kim.griffiths@lwcharterschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Tracking of Professional Development points, sign in sheets for collaborative planning meetings, sign in sheets and evaluations for all on campus professional development, teacher certification documentation from the state,

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

It is important for the staff to receive high quality and ongoing professional development from the experts from the state and/or program. In addition, it is also important to determine who is implementing the learning as evident in their lesson plans which should translate to increase of learning gains on progress monitoring and/or tier 1.

Action Steps to Implement

The following action steps to implement the area of focus for reading:

- Continue to attend the coach meetings monthly with fidelity
- Have a print rich environment with active word walls for the second half of the year
- Analyze the Wonders program for the strength of the standards for reading
- Attend the MTSS data check meetings with fidelity
- Implement the tier 3 programs with fidelity.

Person Responsible

Kim Griffiths (kim.griffiths@lwcharterschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	Due to the dramatic decrease in math, there is a critical need to develop math vocabulary, fluency with math facts, and professional development for those who are teaching math to have math taught at a conceptual level with manipulatives.
Description and Rationale:	
Measureable Outcome:	Our goal is to see an increase by 10% with each progress monitoring window. The fourth and fifth grade teachers will track the growth of the standards with the use of Acaletics each month and/or a google spreadsheet to ensure the reteaching is effective. Attendance will also be taken for collaborative planning meetings to ensure that the teachers are training for fidelity.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored with attendance documented for each training and collaborative meetings. The use of Acaletics will be documented in lesson plans and the use of manipulatives will be observed during observations and walk throughs with the reading coach.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Genifer Gunn (genifer.gunn@lwcharterschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tracking of Professional Development points, sign in sheets for collaborative planning meetings, sign in sheets and evaluations for all on campus professional development, teacher certification documentation from the state.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It is important for the staff to receive high quality and ongoing professional development from the experts from Acaletics and/or have the math coach model for them. In addition, it is also important to determine who is implementing the learning as evident in their lesson plans which should translate to increase of learning gains on progress monitoring and/or tier 1.

Action Steps to Implement

The action steps we are taking for math:

- Progress monitoring of Acaletics to track grow of the standards bi-monthly for grades 1-5
- Progress monitoring of Rocket Math quarterly to show improvements of fluency
- Fidelity of Khan Academy for grades 3-5 and iStation Math K-5
- Modeling of manipulatives and other strategies with the math coach
- Intervention group with fifth grade math students by the math coach

Person Responsible Genifer Gunn (genifer.gunn@lwcharterschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

When comparing the discipline data using the SafeSchoolsforAlex tool, Janie Howard Wilson noticed a high trend with out of school suspensions. The trend data shows that in 2014, there were 73 out of school suspensions and as of 2019, there are 38 out of school suspension. In order to improve this area, Janie Howard Wilson Elementary will provide an opportunity for students to still come on campus and resolve discipline concerns in other ways such as work detail or in school suspensions. In order to continue to work on the school culture, further discipline trainings will be given to the staff. Discipline data will be shared with the staff frequently and feedback will be given to determine next steps to continue to improve on the data. Janie Howard Wilson will provide the staff with a full time social worker and implement Sanford Harmony/Cloud 9 and other recognition programs for PBS each month.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

Janie Howard Wilson has established a routine for a growth mindset. The school has rebuilt the website to ensure that there is a clear message about the school environment for all stakeholders. Janie Howard Wilson has also recreated their social media (Facebook and Instagram) to enhance the positive school culture and environment. There are monthly zoom parent meetings to continue to educate the families of school functions and there is an increase of family activity nights.

The school has also increased the level of communications to include: newsletters in both English and Spanish, weekly callouts, dojo communication app, and social media posts. In addition, we recognize Students of the Month and staff treats to show appreciation of their efforts. Each quarter, we recognize the efforts of the students with their academics by providing awards for proficiency and improvement. The school also does assemblies with the growth mindset and kindness act through the Ned Show. There was also a request for PAX discipline to come for a training. The leadership team in conjunction with the grade chairs have developed discipline codes to implement a consistent level of communication when there is a concern on campus.

Janie Howard Wilson will also be moving toward the implementation of a PYP/IB school. There will be additional activities as we move towards candidacy. Janie Howard Wilson Elementary is also participating in many community events such as the town parades, a town jamboree, and any community service projects such as the food drive. We continue to highlight the cultural changes through the use of signs and publications with the grants we are receiving. Our goal is to continue to work with increasing our business

partners and establishing a routine to show our thanks and appreciation with their role for the positive school culture and environment.

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

The following stakeholders are responsible for promoting a positive culture and environment at Janie Howard Wilson Elementary:

- Title One Teacher: Mrs. Finnell
- Social Media/Website/Parent Involvement: Mrs. Finnell
- PTO Members
- SAC Committee
- Leadership Team- Dr. Ray; Kim Griffiths; Betty Finnell; Genifer Gunn; Hillary Grondin; Elizabeth Borders
- Business Partners: High Point Church; Mrs. Augustu; and private donor
- Sheriffs Department, Police and Fire Departments
- Kona Ice
- Lake Wales High School
- Alricky Smith
- Anuj Saran

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$98,808.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3240	100-Salaries	1401 - Janie Howard Wilson School	Title, I Part A	390.0	\$98,808.00
			<i>Notes: -50% of the Reading Resource Position from Title One Budget -100% of the ESE Inclusion Para to support reading goals for ESE -50% of the Network Manager to support reading programs and incentives</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$100,170.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3240	100-Salaries	1401 - Janie Howard Wilson School	Title, I Part A	390.0	\$100,170.00
			<i>Notes: -100% of Math Resource Teacher -50% of the Network Manager for math program and incentive</i>			
Total:						\$198,978.00