

The School District of Lee County

G. Weaver Hipps Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

G. Weaver Higgs Elementary School

1200 HOMESTEAD RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

<http://hpe.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Deborah Nauss

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Lee 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

G. Weaver Hipps Elementary School

1200 HOMESTEAD RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

<http://hpe.leeschools.net/>

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	No	86%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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 G Weaver Hipps Elementary is to prepare all students to read and comprehend at high levels.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision is to achieve social and academic excellence in a caring environment.

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
Nauss, Deborah	Principal	<p>Dr. Nauss is the Principal. She is responsible for maintaining a school climate that supports student engagement in learning and generates high expectations for learning growth by all students. She must work collaboratively with all stakeholders to develop and implement an instructional framework and implement FEAPs (Florida Educator Accomplished Practices). Dr. Nauss monitors data analysis for instructional planning and improvement and implements the district and states adopted academic standards and curriculum. She is responsible for recruiting, retaining, and developing an effective and diverse staff.</p> <p>*Schedules meetings with Leadership Team to plan for the work of high-performing collaborative teams; focusing on examining data for the purpose of improving student learning and developing a culture of continuous improvement.</p>
Hernandez, Cynthia	Assistant Principal	<p>Mrs. Hernandez is the Asst. Principal. She assists in achieving results towards school's goals and engages the faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps. She is responsible for monitoring data analysis and planning for academic improvement. She fosters the implementation of the district and state adopted academic standards and curriculum. She works closely with all stakeholders to develop and implement the school wide discipline and Family Engagement plan and also facilitates the implementation of the school safety plan.</p> <p>*Meets with Leadership Team to plan for the work of high-performing collaborative teams; focusing on examining data for the purpose of improving student learning and developing a culture of continuous improvement.</p>
Lewis-Clarke, Lenora	Instructional Coach	<p>Mrs. Lewis Clarke is a Peer Collaborative Teacher. She is teaching 40% of the day in a 3rd grade classroom. The other 60% is leadership, which includes coaching.</p> <p>*Attends meetings with the Leadership Team to plan for the work of high-performing collaborative teams; focusing on examining data for the purpose of improving student learning and developing a culture of continuous improvement.</p>
Jacobs, Amy	Instructional Coach	<p>Mrs. Jacobs is the MTSS and 504 Coordinator. She schedules parent meetings, maintains school MTSS paperwork and works with teacher on interventions to help students be successful.</p> <p>*Attends meetings with the Leadership Team to plan for the work of high-performing collaborative teams; focusing on examining data for the purpose of improving student learning and developing a culture of continuous improvement.</p>
Paschal, Karen	Instructional Coach	<p>Mrs. Paschal is one of the MTSS Intervention Specialists. She schedules parent meetings, maintains school MTSS paperwork and works with teachers on interventions to help students be successful.</p> <p>*Attends meetings with the Leadership Team to plan for the work of high-performing collaborative teams; focusing on examining data for the purpose</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		of improving student learning and developing a culture of continuous improvement.
Franco, Pamela	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Franco is a Resource Teacher supporting intermediate teachers and classrooms. She schedules parent meetings, leads PLCs, supports teachers, provides intervention instruction to students, and serves on the Leadership Team.
Ledford, Dawn	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Ledford is a Literacy Coach supporting primary teachers and classrooms. She schedules parent meetings, leads PLCs, supports teachers, implements assessments, provides training, delivers intervention instruction to students, and serves on the Leadership Team.
Wheeler, Carla	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Wheeler is a Resource Teacher supporting primary teachers and classrooms. She schedules parent meetings, leads PLCs, supports teachers, provides intervention instruction to students, and serves on the Leadership Team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Deborah Nauss

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.*

1

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	101	114	112	120	156	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	9	6	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	20	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	6	2	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	17	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	0	5	1	9	23	17	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 10/24/2020

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	135	132	152	162	94	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	811
Attendance below 90 percent	43	20	26	24	8	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	3	3	8	3	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	30	28	30	42	23	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	59	37	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155

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	18	8	12	43	23	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

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	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	135	132	152	162	94	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	811
Attendance below 90 percent	43	20	26	24	8	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	3	3	8	3	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	30	28	30	42	23	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	59	37	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155

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	18	8	12	43	23	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

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	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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	45%	57%	57%	46%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	56%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	55%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	62%	63%	44%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	44%	65%	62%	52%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	54%	51%	48%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	52%	53%	47%	51%	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	47%	58%	-11%	58%	-11%
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
	2018	50%	52%	-2%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	61%	-7%	62%	-8%
	2018	38%	58%	-20%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	62%	-17%	64%	-19%
	2018	47%	58%	-11%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	39%	58%	-19%	60%	-21%
	2018	47%	57%	-10%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	50%	-15%	53%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	52%	-17%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	14	31	33	18	32	39	6				
ELL	28	45	50	35	44	32	33				
BLK	41	42	31	39	31	29	16				
HSP	42	53	50	48	44	22	40				
MUL	53	55		40	55						
WHT	60	53		64	53		38				
FRL	44	50	51	43	40	28	31				
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	22	35	38	19	27	31	10				
ELL	12	46	50	32	54	55	8				
BLK	37	42		35	38	29	33				
HSP	39	50	55	47	53	59	23				
MUL	64			36							
WHT	71	77		59	49		62				
FRL	42	51	47	46	52	50	30				
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	5	46	56	5	31	47					
ELL	20	53	48	31	50	50	17				
BLK	37	51	53	24	38	41	35				
HSP	45	59	53	46	51	51	45				
WHT	58	57		52	60		71				
FRL	41	54	54	39	49	47	43				

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)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	39
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	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	51
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
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.

The data component showing the lowest performance is Math based on the iReady Progress Monitoring Q1 reports for Grades 3-5. The contributing factors would be distance learning challenges that took place during Q4 of the 2019-2020 school year due to Covid 19. In addition the alignment of the Instructional Guides with the curriculum and exemplars. This is not a trend, as the previous year's Q1 progress monitoring score was 52% as evidenced on Q1 STAR Math assessment.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year is proficiency in Math in Grades 3-5. This component dropped from 52% as measured by STAR Math in 2019 to 12% as measured by iReady Math in 2020. The factors contributing to this decline would be the distance learning challenges that took place in Q4 of the 2019-2020 school year due to Covid 19, alignment of the

Instructional Guides with the curriculum and exemplars, and new grade level teachers in Grades K-5. We have 21 new instructional staff to our school this 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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 5th Grade Science, with a discrepancy of -17%. The factors contributing to this gap would be weak science background and new to grade-level teachers. However, for the 2019-2020 school year, GWH placed a great focus in this area with the following results: Q1 proficiency average was 5%, Q2 proficiency average was 28%, and Q3 proficiency average was 43%. Our School Improvement Goal for FY20 was 47%.

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

The data component showing the most improvement is Science, raising from 5% in 2019 to 19% in 2020 as measured by NGSSS Progress Monitoring Q1 data. The actions included a master schedule with a 30-45 minute instructional block for Grades K-5, district support throughout the school year, an additional intervention group, and after school tutoring sessions using targeted instruction. We will continue this school-wide emphasis with the same intervention strategies.

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

Areas of concern for GWH for the 2020-2021 school year would be the potential number of students scoring Level 1 on this year's statewide assessments in Grades 3-5 as measured by the Q1 iReady Progress Monitoring Reports and the NGSSS Progress Monitoring Report.

ELA: 133 students (3rd: 48, 4th: 37, 5th: 48)

Math: 152 students (3rd: 48, 4th: 51, 5th: 53)

Science: 70 students (5th Grade)

Our second potential area of concern is the number of students in K-5 with attendance below 90% (Total of 76 students with 35 of these students having unexcused absences).

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

1. Math proficiency
2. 5th grade Science proficiency
3. ELA proficiency
4. Attendance
5. Number of OSS referrals based District wide Behavior Goal

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The number of students in gr. 5 improved slightly (34% to 36%) based on the FY19 FSSA Report. Upon looking at the data, students were lacking in mastery of standards from grades 3 and 4. Based on this, the master schedule will change to include daily science time for all students K-5.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students in gr. 5 achieving proficiency in science will increase from 36% to 45% as measured by the FY20 FSSA Report.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deborah Nauss (deborahnaus@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 1. Students in grades K-5 will have a minimum of 30-45 minutes built in the master schedule dedicated to science instruction.
2. Teachers will use the district's Instructional Guides to plan for and pace their instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By increasing the time dedicated to science instruction, students will increase their basic science knowledge through daily and consistent lessons.
The Instructional Guides will provide a structure and timeline for teachers to follow.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leading and Learning Teachers in gr. 4 & 5 will meet 3 times per quarter with district leaders for planning. LLTs will meet during PLC with classroom teachers for planning and guidance.
2. Science will be departmentalized in grades 4 and 5.
3. Data (district and school formatives) will be shared at PLC meetings to determine areas of remediation and enrichment.
4. Science District Personnel will be utilized for lesson planning and modeling.
5. Tutoring will be offered to students scoring 2B on the Science Progress Monitoring Assessment.
6. PE waiver group tutoring will be offered to students scoring proficient on 4th gr. ELA yet below proficient on the Science Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Person Responsible: Deborah Nauss (deborahnaus@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the state of Florida FSA report FY 2019, the number of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 making learning gains in math decreased significantly from 50% in FY18 to 30% in FY19 . Upon looking at the data students did not make learning gains in basic math fluency and algebraic thinking skills. Based on teacher reflection, significantly more time needs to be scheduled for math instruction and intervention.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students in the lowest 25% in grades 3, 4 and 5 making learning gains in math will increase from 30% to 55% as measured by the FY20 MATH FSA report.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deborah Nauss (deborahnauss@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: GWH plans to implement departmentalizing of subject areas in 4th and 5th grade. Math instructional times will increase from 60 minutes per day to 75 minutes per day. Math tutoring sessions will be scheduled for our lowest 25%.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increasing the amount of time dedicated to math instruction and using both summative and formative evaluations to guide remediation of standards will increase the proficiency of our lowest 25%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Departmentalizing of subject areas in 4th and 5th grade.
The L25% will receive additional standards-based instruction during the WIN (intervention) block. Standards will be determined through use of formative and summative assessments, as well as teacher observation.
2. Utilizing PCTs and LLTs as core instructors in math for 4th and 5th grade.
3. Students will be identified and invited to attend math tutoring sessions after school to begin after first quarter.
4. Monitoring Plan: teachers will analyze data during PLC meetings and record on Google Doc students that are not proficient in assessed standards. These students will receive additional instruction on that standard. This information, as well as district formatives and STAR will be used to guide instructional planning.
5. A math PE waiver tutoring group will be offered to students scoring 2B on STAR.

Person Responsible Deborah Nauss (deborahnauss@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the state of Florida FSA report FY19, the number of students in grades 3,4, and 5 achieving a Level 3 or above in ELA was at 45%.The number of grades 3, 4 and 5 students proficient in ELA did not increase form FY 18 to FY19 which was also at 45% The proficiency level of ELA 3-5 grade students is below the state and district proficiency levels. While 3rd grade students increased in ELA proficiency from FY 2018 to FY2019 by 10 percent from 37% to 47% proficient, grade 4 decreased in proficiency by 6% from 45% to 39 % proficient and grade 5 decreased in proficiency by 7% from 50% to 43% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students in grades 3,4 and 5 achieving a level 3 or above in ELA will increase from 45% to 55% as measured by the FY20 ELA FSA report.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Nauss (deborahnauss@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Departmentalized instruction in grades 4 and 5 (90 minute uninterrupted ELA block). 2. Teachers in grades 3-5 received Top Score Writing training and will collaborate with plans and scoring. 3.Peer Collaborative Teachers are co-teaching in a self-contained classroom with all of the 2b students in 5th grade. 4. Teachers will incorporate a variety of researched- based strategies 5. Learning Leader Teacher will coach teachers in a variety of areas. 5. Provide an additional 30 to 45 minutes of ELA Intervention and Enrichment in grades 3-5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the ELA data in grades 3,4, and 5, there was no increase in ELA proficiency from FY2018 to FY 2019. The ELA proficiency for grades 3, 4, and 5 remained at 45%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. At GWH, teachers will use data to drive their instructional practices and differentiate their lessons to meet the needs of all learners within the school.
2. Grades 4 and 5 will departmentalize ELA instruction.
3. A school-wide intervention program will be developed to provide intensive instruction (remediation or enrichment) 45 minutes per day based on information gathered from formative/summative evaluations.
4. Read180 will be used as an intervention program in grades 4 and 5.
5. The STAR instructional plan will be used to guide remediation also in grades 3-5.
6. Teachers will plan collaboratively during PLC meetings using the district instructional guides.
7. Resource teachers will monitor and support lesson planning, instruction and data analysis.

Person Responsible Deborah Nauss (deborahnauss@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students who warrant referrals resulting in either ISS or OSS miss instructional time and interfere with the learning of others. Out of 292 referrals, 42 students received either ISS or OSS, resulting in 120 combined missed days for these identified students for the 2018-2019 school year. It is imperative to minimize classroom disruptions so that all students can reach their full potential.

Measurable Outcome: The of number of students with multiple ISS or OSS referrals will decrease from 42 students to 21 students measured by the Mainframe Student Discipline Summary Report by May 2020.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deborah Nauss (deborahnauss@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: School-wide discipline policy
Students with behavior issues will be placed on behavior contracts.
Daily student recognition by all personnel
Classroom and school incentives
Community Partnerships awards programs
School-wide Leader in Me program
Monthly tracking of referrals through the District Support Application (DSA)
Check In/Check Out system with the Behavior Specialist.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Providing students will multiple opportunities for positive experiences while at school and creating a caring, supportive culture, we believe that the number of negative student discipline incidents will decrease.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly tracking of referrals through Mainframe DSA.
2. Leadership notebooks will be used to monitor positive behavior points for the week.
3. Behavior contacts will be monitored weekly by behavior specialist (Check In/Check Out).
4. Parent conferences will be scheduled.
5. Student counseling groups will be formed.
6. After-school detentions
7. Ladies and gentlemen club
8. Leader in Me clubs

Person Responsible Deborah Nauss (deborahnauss@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Upon analyzing school-wide data in FOCUS, we feel the need to establish an attendance committee and continue the school-wide initiative to increase our average daily attendance. STAR data showed that students that had numerous absences and/or tardies scored minimally/substantially below in the core subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2020, the number of students with attendance below 90% as identified by EWS in grades K-5 will decrease from 148 students in the 2018-2019 school year to 100 students as measured by FOCUS data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Nauss (deborahnauss@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students identified through the EWS will be consistently monitored and the classroom teacher/attendance committee will notify the school social worker when the student approaches three absences. The principal will follow up with the social worker to schedule a parent conference. An attendance committee will be created and the school wide attendance incentive program will be continued this year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students that attend school daily perform better on summative and formative assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff creates an emotionally supportive environment where students feel safe to engage in challenging tasks and have equitability of voice.
2. Teachers will work with the Social Worker when attendance problems begin.
3. The Principal will have conferences with parents of students with truancy issues.
4. The attendance committee will monitor weekly attendance.
5. Students are tracking their own attendance through their Leadership Notebooks.
6. Teachers are tracking class attendance and are offering friendly competition with their peers.
7. Weekly and Monthly incentives are provided for individual and class attendance.
8. The Rise and Shine Club will be offered to students to provide a check-in system with the guidance counselor.
9. Attendance concerns will be noted at the MTSS meetings.
10. Attendance concerns will be noted on the student cards on our data wall and discussed at PLC meetings

Person Responsible Deborah Nauss (deborahnauss@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

This school year we are implementing iReady schoolwide. We will use this program to identify additional support and focus resources to target students identified through the current data.

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.

At the beginning of the school year, families and students will be invited to an open house and the Annual Title I meeting where staff will share the vision, mission, and culture of the school.

Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment being invited to/attending monthly SAC meetings, where data will be shared and analyzed for all students groups including regular ed, ESE, gifted, migrant, ELLs, L25, educationally disadvantaged and historically underserved,

Stakeholders will participate as a result of invitation via school newsletter, Peach Jar, personal phone call if needed and flexible meeting times. Community /business partners will be enlisted through personal contact (visits, phone calls) to request partnering with our school.

Input from stakeholders will be collected through surveys and discussions. These communications will be flexible in format allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and create a plan. Parents will be invited to SAC/Title 1 Meeting where the design, implementation and evaluation of the SIP will occur. Parents will contribute the the decisions a to how the 1% of Title 1 money set aside for parent involvement will be spent. Strategies to increase family engagement are included in the PFEP.

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: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00

5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00