G. Weaver Hipps Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

G. Weaver Hipps 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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* 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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 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	87%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nauss, Deborah	Principal	
Miller, Andrew	Assistant Principal	
Lewis-Clarke, Lenora	Other	Educator, Coach, Leadership Team Member
Ledford, Dawn	Reading Coach	Educator, Coach, Leadership Team Member
Franco, Pamela	Other	Educator, Coach, Leadership Team Member
Jacobs, Amy	Other	Educator, Coach, MTSS Coordinator, Leadership Team Member
	Behavior Specialist	

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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

805

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

9

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

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	115	127	120	148	116	164	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	790
Attendance below 90 percent	5	27	35	42	19	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	0	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	3	6	26	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	20	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	37	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	33	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	3	8	28	32	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

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	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				45%	57%	57%	45%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	56%	58%	54%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	50%	53%	49%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				49%	62%	63%	46%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				44%	65%	62%	51%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	54%	51%	50%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	52%	53%	34%	54%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	58%	-11%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	54%	61%	-7%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	62%	-17%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	58%	-19%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	50%	-15%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/6.9	14/12.8	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2/2.1	6/5.6	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/2.7	1/2.6	0/0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/7.6	18/20	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/12.5	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/4.5	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/3.8	4/4.5	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/14.3	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/4.5	1/4.5	0/0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22/21.4	40/36.4	39/34.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/9.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/6.9	18/16.7	35/31.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/18.2	1/9.1	1/9.1
	English Language Learners	1/6.3	0/0	2/11.8

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41/27.2	67/41.1	68/42
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.3	3/15	2/10
	English Language Learners	3/10.3	5/17.2	3/10.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/5.4	21/13	37/23.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/5
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/3.4	3/10.7

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/24.8	41/31.1	93/29.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/7.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/5.3	3/15
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/6.4	17/13.2	26/19.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/15.4
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	2/10
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24/19.4	45/34.9	53/39
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/18.2	1/8.3	4/30.8
	English Language Learners	2/11.1	3/16.7	6/30

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8	38	50	21	31	27	25				
ELL	14	33	44	27	29	36	9				
BLK	31	38		39	50		20				
HSP	33	41	45	33	24	20	32				
MUL	59			59							
WHT	53	72		56	47		68				
FRL	31	41	55	32	27	28	33				

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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	318

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

The trends that emerge across grade levels are that the school's percent proficient and the school's learning gains have been around the same percentage from year to year in grades 3, 4, and 5. The school's ELA achievement is the same for 2018, 2019, and each progress monitoring window showed an increase in the number of students proficient across all grades levels and in most subgroups as well. . While there has been a slight decrease in ELA Learning Gains, ELA Lowest 25th Percentile, Math Learning Gains, Math Lowest 25th Percentile. The school's data show increases in Math Achievement and Science Achievement.

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

The data components based on progress monitoring and the 2019 state assessments that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are ELA Learning Gains, ELA Lowest 25th Percentile, Math Learning Gains, Math Lowest 25th Percentile.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement are that our student population historically has issues with attendance and a history of lack of parent involvement pre-pandemic. The issues have worsened during the COVID 19 Pandemic and continue to reflect a lack of parent involvement with

student academics especially with online learning, students being quarantined, and missing direct teacher instruction.

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

The data components, based on progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, that showed the most improvement was the school's math achievement for grades 3, 4, and 5.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement are the school's use of online tools for math fluency with the use of Reflex Math, I-Ready math components, the tutoring program for math, and designated time for math during WIN Time.

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

The strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning are the continuation of the use of online tools for math fluency with the use of Reflex Math, I-Ready math components, the tutoring program for math, and designated time for math during WIN Time. We have also hired math coaches for our school; one for the primary grades and one for the intermediate grades.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning are Reflex Math training, I-Ready math training, and PD delivered by the school's math coaches based on math best practices.

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

The additional services that will be implemented to ensure the sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond are PD using Kagan structure with math standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:
No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our school did not have any data in the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org site to use for the comparison of the discipline data of the school and the discipline data across the state to be able to provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. We can, however, include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data. Our school has implemented the Leader in Me program which we have married with the PBSIS program, our school also has a school dean position, SEL teacher,

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.

Our school uses the Leader in Me program to build a positive school culture and environment for both students and staff. We provide training to teachers to help them learn deescalating strategies and we provide training on the use of the PBIS program.

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

The school's core Leader in Me/PBIS team members is responsible for making sure that the students and staff receive training on the school's program. The team's core members are Jennifer Schwartz, Allison Frey, Robin Osborne, Adrienne Quartrochi, Katy Stich, Katherine Ramirez, Grace Howell, Carleen Daniels, Angela Hunter, Morgan Anderson, Pamela Franco, Kim Conrad, Lenora Lewis-Clarke, Andrew Miller, and Deborah Nauss.

Part V: Budget

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

Total:	**$0.00**