School Board of Levy County

Whispering Winds Charter School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Jenoor Demograpines	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Whispering Winds Charter School

2481 NW OLD FANNIN RD, Chiefland, FL 32626

http://www.whisperingwindscharter.com/

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Bartley

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
	2018-19: A (62%)
	2017-18: C (44%)
School Grades History	2016-17: C (46%)
	2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement	(SI) Information*
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	<u>Dustin Sims</u>
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administra	ative Code. For more information, click

School Board Approval

<u>here</u>.

Last Modified: 2/12/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 3 of 16

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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.

Last Modified: 2/12/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 16

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

We provide a public school option for for parents of Pre-K - 5th grade students in Levy, Gilchrist and Dixie Counties. Our Mission is for all students to achieve academic success by providing an orderly, trusting, safe and caring environment supporting accomadated learning styles and responsibility-based self discipline.

Provide the school's vision statement

Our primary vision, as a school community, is to establish positive relationships among staff, parents, studnets, and community partners to provide learning experiences that inspire a lifelong love and commitment to learning, and to prepare studnets for college and career readiness is a rigorous learning environment utilizing hands-on and technology supported instruction.

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
Bartley, Kim	Principal	Kim Bartley serves as one of the directors of Whispering Winds Charter School. She is responsible for the daily operation of the school. This includes but is not limited to school and district paperwork, overseeing the personnel of the school, behavior and discipline, parent communication, providing professional development to staff, and student interaction. Conducting instructional staff meetings weekly to discuss school/classroom issues and data. PD is planned or brought to the school by one or both directors based on needs of the teachers or students.
Pittman, Jennifer	Principal	Jennifer Smith-Pittman serves as one of the directors of Whispering Winds Charter School. She is responsible for the daily operation of the school. This includes but is not limited to school and district paperwork, overseeing the personnel of the school, behavior and discipline, parent communication, providing professional development to staff, and student interaction. Conducting instructional staff meetings weekly to discuss school/classroom issues and data. PD is planned or brought to the school by one or both directors based on needs of the teachers or students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/1/2016, Kimberly Bartley

Last Modified: 2/12/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 5 of 16

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.

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.

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school 6

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement	(SI) Information*
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	<u>Dustin Sims</u>
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.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	15	19	16	19	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	

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

Indicator						Gra	ade	e L	ev	el				Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	iotai
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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

Monday 8/31/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	21	17	17	21	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		

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

Indicator					(Gra	ade	e L	ev	el				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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indiantor		Grade Level														
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total		
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		

Prior Year - Updated

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	21	17	17	21	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		

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

Indicator						Gra	ade	e L	ev	el				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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator		Grade Level											Total	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Last Modified: 2/12/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 8 of 16

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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		2019		2018			
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	
ELA Achievement	51%	49%	57%	35%	43%	56%	
ELA Learning Gains	70%	59%	58%	42%	44%	55%	
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	53%	0%	44%	48%	
Math Achievement	64%	58%	63%	38%	52%	62%	
Math Learning Gains	80%	64%	62%	54%	47%	59%	
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	51%	64%	40%	47%	
Science Achievement	44%	50%	53%	33%	46%	55%	

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator		Grade Lo	evel (pri	or year r	eported)		Total	
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	IOLAI	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)	

Grade Level Data

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
03	2019	67%	52%	15%	58%	9%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	57%	-7%
Same Grade C	omparison	17%				
Cohort Com	parison					
04	2019	57%	48%	9%	58%	-1%
	2018	27%	41%	-14%	56%	-29%
Same Grade C	omparison	30%				
Cohort Com	parison	7%				
05	2019	35%	44%	-9%	56%	-21%
	2018	32%	44%	-12%	55%	-23%
Same Grade C	omparison	3%				
Cohort Com	parison	8%				

MATH									
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison			
03	2019	56%	55%	1%	62%	-6%			

Last Modified: 2/12/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 9 of 16

			MATH			
Grade	Year	Year School District District		School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	62%	-12%
Same Grade C	omparison	6%				
Cohort Com						
04	2019	71%	59%	12%	64%	7%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	62%	-26%
Same Grade C	omparison	35%				
Cohort Com	parison	21%				
05	2019	55%	53%	2%	60%	-5%
	2018	32%	53%	-21%	61%	-29%
Same Grade C	omparison	23%				
Cohort Com	parison	19%				

	SCIENCE											
Grade	ade Year		District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison						
05	2019	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%						
	2018	32%	48%	-16%	55%	-23%						
Same Grade C	13%											
Cohort Com	parison											

Subgroup [Data										
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	46			54							
WHT	51	78	·	68	78		50				
FRL	61	82		64	88		40				

	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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16	
SWD	18	55		25	25							
WHT	28	33		33	50		36					
FRL	35	42		35	52	60	35					

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	62

ESSA Federal Index	
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	309
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
	N/A
Federal Index - Asian Students	N/A 0
Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	
Federal Index - Asian Students Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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 - 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	0
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?	0 N/A
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%	0 N/A
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 Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% Hispanic Students	0 N/A
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 Federal Index - Hispanic Students	0 N/A 0
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 Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	0 N/A 0
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 Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0 N/A 0
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 Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students	0 N/A 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	65						
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	67						
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO						
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0						

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Fifth grade ELA and science Data showed the lowest performance for WWCS. Fifth grade ELA had 35% proficiency which is 9 percentage points lower than the district average and 21 percentage points lower than the state average. These two areas showed the lowest growth and were under the district or state average for proficiency. The main factors contributing to this is that many students are not fully introduced to science concepts before the fifth grade and a class containing majority high need students.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

All FSA components increased from the 17-18 to the 18-19 school year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Last Modified: 2/12/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 12 of 16

While there was increase from year to year some grades were below proficiancy levels in the 2019 school year compared to state averages. Fifth grade reading, math, and science had the largest gaps between the school and state averages. Factors contributing to this we believe are not enough exposure to concepts in math and science

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The area that showed the most growth was ELA learning gains. There was a 28 percentage point gain. The actions our school took were to strategically place struggling students in small groups with specific teachers that best met their needs to enhance intervention. Ex. Some students worked in intervention groups with their teacher while others worked in intervention groups with a different teacher based on what they needed. Students who needed intervention in phonics worked with the teacher who was strongest in phonics etc.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

- 1. Maintaining school Grade
- 2. Improving Fifth Grade Science scores
- 3. Improving attendance rates for students with chronic absences

4.

5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

Last Modified: 2/12/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 13 of 16

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students will be strategically placed in intervention groups based on need. Each student's data(i-Ready, FSA, and classroom assessments) in the area of ELA specifically phonics is reviewed by administration and teachers. Students are placed with teachers who best fit their intervention needs. Students who are low in phonics are placed in intervention with teachers who are Orton-Gillingham trained. Students receiving tier 2 and 3 interventions will receive small group and one-to-one instruction 3-5 days a week. The rationale for selecting this strategy is that students who are in need of additional assistance through tier 2 and 3 intervention learn best in small group or one-to-one situations.

Measureable Outcome:

By the end of the 2020-2021 school year all students placed in tier 2 and 3 intervention groups will increase their phonics score on i-Ready by one grade level.

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

Kim Bartley (kimberly.bartley@levy.k12.fl.us)

Evidencebased Strategy: Students identified as in need of tier 2 and 3 intervention in phonics will recieve small group or one-to-one interventions using the Orton-Gillingham phonics program.

Rationale

for Evidencebased Strategy: The rationale for selecting this strategy is that students who are in need of additional assistance through tier 2 and 3 intervention learn best in small group or one-to-one situations. Orton-Gillingham phonics program is a systematic and repetitive intervention for these students.

Action Steps to Implement

Diagnostic testing of all students Review of previous tests from 2019-2020 school year Placement of students in tier groups administering Phonics program Weekly Progress monitoring

Person Responsible

Kim Bartley (kimberly.bartley@levy.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Science Concepts will be taught across grades at the appropriate level using new science curriculum. Teachers will be expected to show that science is being taught by including science lessons and standards in lesson plans that are turned in weekly. Teachers will be expected to provide more hands on science experiements so that students become aware of the process of the scientific method. All classes and students will be required to participate in a school science fair to show their progress towards science standards taught.

Parents and families of students with chronic attendance issues will be notified in person and by letter when a student reachers five absences. Upon the 10th absence Parents must come to an in-person meeting with administration.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school will build positive culture by maintaining positive parent to school relationships. To do this teachers must contact each family monthly through phone or in person meetings. Teachers are required to meet with families once per nine weeks as well to discuss student progress. Teachers and parents our encouraged to communicate any issues that may arise with each other to problem solve. The school also holds multiple functions throughout the year to involve families. Events such as reading nights, math nights, science fair, testing information night, and parent family involvement trainings are held every year. These events help to introduce parents to our curriculum and keep them informed on what is going on in the classroom. Whispering Winds reaches out to all community members to be involved in school functions. We advertise all events on out website and social media pages for parents and other community members to see. Invites are also delivered to businesses throughout the community when an event is held. Whispering Winds has a SAC made of different parents and community members that aide in the decision making for our school. Whispering Winds will also incorperate professional development and training provided by our district and Dr. Constantino. Through this training Dr. Constantino provides teacher's insight on how best to communicate and work with parents.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

Last Modified: 2/12/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 15 of 16

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

	Part V: Budget		
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
		Total:	\$0.00