

School Board of Levy County

Whispering Winds Charter School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged 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	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 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Whispering Winds Charter School

2481 NW OLD FANNIN RD, Chiefland, FL 32626

<http://www.whisperingwindscharter.com/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	28%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	C	C

School Board Approval

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 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.

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

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.*

0

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.*

2

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged 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	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](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
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														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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	

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	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	49%	57%	47%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	59%	58%	59%	55%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	53%	0%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	58%	63%	43%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	80%	64%	62%	41%	52%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	51%	0%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	50%	53%	40%	47%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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 Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	48%	9%	58%	-1%
	2018	27%	41%	-14%	56%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	35%	44%	-9%	56%	-21%
	2018	32%	44%	-12%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	55%	1%	62%	-6%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	59%	12%	64%	7%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	62%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		35%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
05	2019	55%	53%	2%	60%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	32%	53%	-21%	61%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				

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

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	55		25	25						
WHT	28	33		33	50		36				
FRL	35	42		35	52	60	35				
2017 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	31			38							
WHT	43	62		37	43						
FRL	47	50		47	40						

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
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	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
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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
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.

While there was increase from year to year some grades were below proficiency 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:

#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.

Measurable 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)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based 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 experiments 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 reaches 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 are 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 our 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 incorporate 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

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

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