

School Board of Levy County

# Whispering Winds Charter School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: D (40%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: C (44%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/25/2022.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	25%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		A	A

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/25/2022.

### 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 accommodated 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, students, and community partners; to provide learning experiences that inspire a lifelong love and commitment to learning; and to prepare students for college and career readiness in a rigorous learning environment utilizing hands-on and technology supported instruction.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bartley, Kim	Director	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 and paperwork, overseeing the personnel of the school, behavior and discipline, parent communication, providing professional development to staff, and student interaction. She conducts instructional staff meetings weekly to discuss school/classroom issue and data. Professional Development is planned or brought to the school by one or both directors based on needs of the teachers or students.
Pittman, Jennifer	Director	Jennifer 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 and paperwork, overseeing the personnel of the school, behavior and discipline, parent communication, providing professional development to staff, and student interaction. She conducts instructional staff meetings weekly to discuss school/classroom issue and data. Professional Development is planned or brought to the school by one or both directors based on needs of the teachers or students.
Gardner, Katie		As instructional coach Katie Gardner is responsible for all attending district cadres and professional developments. One of Katie's many duties is to relay information gained from cadres and professional development to the staff of Whispering Winds Charter. Katie is also responsible for reviewing curriculum with principals and to aid in the decision making process. She is responsible for mentoring teachers in need in the areas of reading, math, and science. Katie is responsible for providing resources and instruction to teachers in need. She pushes in and pulls out for small group instruction. Katie also serves on the schools threat assessment team. Katie also attends district reading coach meetings for the school and provides teachers and staff with information gained in these meetings.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/1/2016, Kimberly Bartley

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

1

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

7

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

130

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

0

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

1

**Demographic Data****Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	21	19	18	18	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	0	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/18/2022



**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	20	17	18	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	3	4	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

**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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	20	17	18	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	3	4	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

#### 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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	32%	50%	56%				51%	49%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	33%						70%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								55%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	49%	50%				64%	58%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						80%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%							42%	51%
Science Achievement	20%	52%	59%				44%	50%	53%

### 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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	67%	52%	15%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	48%	9%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	35%	44%	-9%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	56%	55%	1%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	59%	12%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	29	27		71	55						
WHT	31	33		56	59	36	22				
FRL	34	33		64	58		20				
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	18			55							
WHT	34			50							
FRL	33			52							
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				

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	241
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	
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	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?

One trend that is apparent is decreasing reading/ELA proficiency and ELA learning gains across grades 3-5 when analyzing FSA scores.

Another trend that is emerging is that students in the subgroup of SWD have decreasing achievement levels in the area of ELA

Another trend that is emerging is a decline in state achievement scores in the area of science.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The areas that demonstrate the greatest needs based off of state assessments are ELA achievement and learning gains and Science achievement.

Whispering Winds ELA Achievement has decreased from 51% in 2019, 39% in 2021, to 32% in 2022.

ELA learning gains have decreased from 70% in 2019, 40% in 2021, to 33% in 2022.

Whispering Winds science achievement has decreased from 55% in 2021 to 20% in 2022.

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

Factors that contributed to this need for improvement are: grades 3-5 changed ability grouping strategies and opportunities when working with students in reading and science intervention. Students in grades 3-5 received less targeted and specific foundational reading interventions and more vocabulary centered interventions than in the 2019-2021 years. Fifth grade science employed the push-in model versus the pull-out small group intervention model in the previous year.

New Actions:

Grades 3-5 will base ability groups for reading and math intervention groups from school progress monitoring data (i-Ready and FAST) and 21-22 FSA data for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.

Grades 3-5 will receive targeted and specific foundational skill interventions in reading where needed based off of data from school progress monitoring data (i-Ready and FAST) and 21-22 FSA data

Grades 3-5 will continue to incorporate vocabulary interventions class wide and in small ability-based intervention groups.

Grades 3-5 will use new foundation skills phonics curriculum- Sadlier- Phonics to Reading- in tier 2 and 3 interventions for students still in need of phonics interventions.

5th Grade science will employ the pull out intervention strategy for students that need further instruction and intervention based on curriculum assessments and science LIA scores.

Grade 5 will use Generation Genius, a new curriculum for ability based science intervention groups in addition to the core science curriculum.

New Instructional Coach will be providing facilitation to teachers in the areas of reading, science, and math and working with tier 2 and tier 3 intervention groups.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Grade 3 FSA math showed the most improvement.

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

As a charter Whispering Winds has the ability to choose its curriculum. In the subject of math we choose to use a different curriculum in math than the rest of our district. The third grade teacher followed the curriculum with fidelity and incorporated math games and manipulatives with every lesson. A daily math review was given to review and spiral math skills. The teacher and paraprofessional worked in small ability groups to teach and review the math skills and standards daily.

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

Students will need to receive quality tier 1,2,and 3 interventions. Teachers will be instructed on quality tier 1 instruction. Students in need based on i-Ready data, FSA, and FAST progress monitoring will receive tier 2 and 3 interventions in foundational reading and math skills. These interventions will be delivered in a small group format. Additional intervention curriculum will be purchased to use with these groups in Reading, Math, and Science.

Students identified with a severe need and/or lowest quartile will receive the first opportunity for after school tutoring.

**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.**

Teachers will receive professional development in quality tier 1 teaching strategies. Teachers and administration will receive professional development on using the sadlier Phonics to Reading program.

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

An instructional coach will be employed to aide the teachers in instructional practices. The instructional coach will provide resources, support, and model teaching to grade level teachers. The instructional coach will provide tier 2 and tier 3 intervention to specific groups identified to have need.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**  
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The ELA achievement score was 32% and there has been a continual decrease in ELA Achievement and Learning Gains since the 2019 school year.

4th grade i-Ready reading on or above grade level was 46% at the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

5th grade i-Ready reading on or above grade level was 43% at the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:**  
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

For the 2022-2023 school year 4th and 5th grade students will increase the number of students scoring proficient or higher in ELA by 15 percentage points, from 32% to 47% as evidenced by Florida Assessment for Student Thinking.

**Monitoring:**  
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will take the i-Ready diagnostic 3 times a year for monitoring as well as analyze monthly reports on usage and pass rates.

Students will take FAST Assessments three times during the 2022-2023 school year to monitor progress to our school goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Pittman (jennifer.pittman@levyk12.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Students identified as below grade level in 4th and 5th grade using i-Ready will be placed in tier 2 and tier 3 reading intervention small groups or in a one-to-one basis. Evidence based curriculum will be used to fill gaps in their instruction in the area of phonics. Specifically Orton-Gillingham phonics program and Sadlier Phonics to Reading program. The Rewards curriculum will also be used for students in need of additional grade level phonics and vocabulary instruction in 4th and 5th grade. K-3 students will integrate Sadlier phonics into their core instruction as a supplemental resource to strengthen foundational skills.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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 and Sadlier Reading to Phonics are systematic and repetitive interventions for these students to help close the gap and strengthen foundational skills.



**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students in 4th and 5th grade will be strategically placed in intervention groups based on FAST, FSA, and i-Ready. 4th and 5th grade students who are low in phonics will receive intervention with teachers who are Orton-Gillingham trained or receive training in the Sadlier phonics program or specific i-Ready lessons. These students receiving tier 2 and 3 interventions will receive small group and/or one-to-one instruction 3-5 days a week. 4th and 5th students will receive interventions in the classroom and/or additional "pull-out" model interventions. All 4th and 5th grade students will receive lessons on vocabulary and comprehension using whole and small group in the classroom.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Pittman (jennifer.pittman@levyk12.org)

Teachers will receive professional development on the Sadlier Phonics Program to ensure fidelity of implementation in the core instruction of grades K-3 and for interventions for identified 4th and 5th grade students.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Pittman (jennifer.pittman@levyk12.org)

Students scoring the lowest quartile as identified by FAST and FSA will be placed in after school tutoring for additional instructional support in reading.

**Person Responsible** Katie Gardner (katie.gardner@levyk12.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Fifth grade Science FCAT scored 20% proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Fifth grade science FCAT proficiency will increase by 30 percentage points, from 20% to 50% on the 2023 FCAT.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Fifth grade science will be monitored using a beginning and mid year Science LIA and curriculum based assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Students will be ability grouped during science interventions and receive small group instruction. Teachers will conduct a minimum of one hands-on science activity per unit. The science educational program Generation Genius will be used in addition to the core science curriculum.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The rationale for selecting this strategy is that students who are in need of additional assistance through tier 2 and 3 intervention in science learn best in small group or one-to-one situations.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students will be strategically placed in intervention groups based on need. Each student's data( Science LIA and classroom assessments) in the area of Science is reviewed by administration and teachers. Students are placed with teachers who best fit their intervention needs. Students who are low in science will be placed in intervention with teachers. Students receiving tier 2 and 3 interventions will receive small group and one-to-one instruction 3-5 days a week. Students in the fifth grade will receive additional "pull-out" model interventions.

**Person Responsible**

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

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

N/A

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

N/A

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

**Action Step****Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

## **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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

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 as 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 the directors of the school.

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

The stakeholders, in promoting a positive culture and environment at Whispering Winds, consist of the: Directors- Kim Bartley and Jennifer Pittman- As the directors of the school Kim and Jennifer are responsible for promoting a positive atmosphere to all staff, students, and families. They are also responsible for finding and providing professional development opportunities for staff that relate to relationships in the work environment and with school families.

All instructional and non-instructional staff- Staff are responsible for fostering and maintaining good/positive relationships with students, co-workers, and school families. They are responsible for attending and participating in any Professional development that is brought to them by the directors or district and incorporating those concepts into the classroom and school environment to better enhance the positive culture.

Whispering Winds Board Members- Board Members are responsible for the school and staff as a whole. Making sure that Directors Kim and Jennifer have access to anything that they may need for the staff and students to be successful and maintain a positive environment. The board is also responsible for handling any grievances that may arise among staff or school families and helping them to return to a positive atmosphere.