Gulf County Schools

Wewahitchka Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

3
4
6
9
13
0
0

Wewahitchka Elementary School

514 E RIVER RD, Wewahitchka, FL 32465

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer G UF Fey

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	ormation*
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F	or more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Gulf County School Board on 9/8/2022.

Last Modified: 5/2/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 3 of 17

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:

- have a school grade of D or F
- 2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
- 3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Wewahitchka Elementary School

514 E RIVER RD, Wewahitchka, FL 32465

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Gi (per MSID		2021-22 Title I School	l Disadvan	2 Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S PK-6	School	Yes		96%
Primary Servio (per MSID I		Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		14%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	С		С	С

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Gulf County School Board on 9/8/2022.

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.

Wewahitchka Elementary School is helping students build a foundation for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wewahitchka Elementary School strives to establish a safe and caring learning environment by promoting the highest level of achievement for ALL students. We are committed to implementing high expectations of character development with respect, responsibility, honesty, hard work, attitude, and self-control. The faculty and staff at Wewahitchka Elementary School work to develop well-rounded, responsible individuals to build a foundation for life-long learning.

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
Guffey, Jennifer	Principal	Leader of the School
Ludlam, Kimberley	Administrative Support	School-wide curriculum coordinator/support, principal designee
Bailey, Stephanie	School Counselor	Provides support to administrators, assists with data collection, and progress monitors and coordinates/ provides support for student social and academic needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/23/2022, Jennifer G UF Fey

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.

0

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.

C

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

506

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

7

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

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
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
Number of students enrolled	53	77	70	72	62	65	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	10	7	8	3	6	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	15	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
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						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	5	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	ve					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/23/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	75	76	72	59	67	77	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	486
Attendance below 90 percent	9	24	18	14	14	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	13	27	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	26	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
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													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
Students with two or more indicators	3	1	2	2	3	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	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
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
Number of students enrolled	75	76	72	59	67	77	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	486
Attendance below 90 percent	9	24	18	14	14	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	13	27	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	26	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
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		
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAT
Students with two or more indicators	3	1	2	2	3	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	
ELA Achievement	48%	49%	56%				46%	50%	57%	
ELA Learning Gains	61%						49%	48%	58%	
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						40%	37%	53%	
Math Achievement	55%	53%	50%				51%	49%	63%	
Math Learning Gains	54%						55%	48%	62%	
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						49%	38%	51%	
Science Achievement	36%	55%	59%				32%	46%	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 Con	nparison					
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				
03	2022					
	2019	42%	53%	-11%	58%	-16%
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	46%	-4%	58%	-16%
Cohort Con	nparison	-42%				
05	2022					

			ELA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
	2019	40%	42%	-2%	56%	-16%
Cohort Com	nparison	-42%				
06	2022					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	54%	1%
Cohort Con	Cohort Comparison					

			MATH	I		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison					
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Co	Cohort Comparison					
03	2022					
	2019	42%	55%	-13%	62%	-20%
Cohort Co	mparison	0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	64%	-13%
Cohort Co	mparison	-42%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	39%	3%	60%	-18%
Cohort Co	mparison	-51%			<u>'</u>	
06	2022					
	2019	62%	47%	15%	55%	7%
Cohort Co	mparison	-42%			· '	

			SCIENC	E		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	32%	46%	-14%	53%	-21%
Cohort Com	nparison					
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Com	-32%					

Subgroup Data Review

		2022	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	32	65	57	30	49	55	29				
BLK	25	73		25	42						
WHT	51	61	54	57	56	53	40				
FRL	35	58	60	41	51	55	17				
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	12	23	40	25	45	33					
BLK	15	20		14	30						
WHT	39	39	45	51	55	44	33				
FRL	26	33	35	35	52	33	12				
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	15	28	28	19	45	41	10				
BLK	11	25	29	4	17	25	8				
WHT	51	53	45	59	62	57	40				
FRL	42	46	37	50	54	49	33				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
	N/A
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	N/A 0
Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	0
Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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?	0 N/A
Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0 N/A
Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students	0 N/A 0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
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?

ELA scores in grades 3-6 tend to run between 40-55% proficient. Our most recent scores show 4th and 5th grades to be in the most need for ELA growth. Longitudinal data show 5th grade science to be consistently weak.

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

4th and 5th Grades ELA 5th Grade Science

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

New ELA curriculum, large number of faculty turnover

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

3rd Grade ELA

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

Consistency of 3rd grade teachers from year to year, research/study of new curriculum into implementation

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

2nd year of ELA curriculum (teachers are more comfortable), training/ELA updates, small group instruction, new placement of 5th grade science teacher,

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.

6 early dismissal days for students (teacher training/PD days), observation, modeling

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

School-wide Accelerated Reader program implemented at a higher level Greater data disaggregation
Progress Monitoring Based testing

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.

Florida Standards Assessment scores of 2022 showed a critical need in ELA in both 4th and 5th grades scoring below 50% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

WES plans to improve scores in both 4th and 5th grade ELA to be above 50% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through observation, progress monitoring based testing (with training), confidence in ELA curriculum, AR, District ELA Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Freckle, STAR Literacy, FAST

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Progress Monitoring with Freckle correlates with growth/proficiency on the FAST.

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.

Monthly meetings with educational teams Implementation of District ELA Coach Observations/Walk-Throughs Progress Monitoring Implementation of test specification AR

Person Responsible Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Last Modified: 5/2/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 14 of 17

#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.

5th Grade Science scores on the NGSSS showed a critical need scoring at 36% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific

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

5th Grade students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency on the NGSSS.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through observations, modeling, progress monitoring by teachers and District Data Coach, input/ collaboration with PAEC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

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

Input from the District Data Coach that students the data to assist with improving our 5th Grade Science scores.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the selecting this strategy.

Through the study of past science scores and looking at the weakest area, the District Data Coach is helping target specific needs to show improvement with ideas of tracking standards in lower grades and confirming the greatest needs in this area. This was done last year, but this resources/criteria used for year will be done with a new teacher in 5th grade.

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.

Communication with teachers/District Data Coach Implementation of District Data Coach suggestions Observations/Walk-Throughs Progress Monitoring with unit tests and standards Supplemental instructional tools Implementation of test specifications

Person Responsible Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

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

Florida Standards Assessment scores of 2022 showed a critical need in Math of 5th grade students scoring below 50% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

5th grade students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency on the FAST for the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through observations, modeling, progress monitoring (Freckle, FAST), monthly meetings with educational team, collaborative planning, input/collaboration with District Math Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

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

Freckle, Star Math, FAST, new math curriculum

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Progress Monitoring with Freckle correlates with growth/ proficiency on the FAST.

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.

Communication with teachers/District Math Coach/Principal

Monthly Meetings

Classroom Observations

Progress Monitoring

Professional Development for teachers with new math curriculum

Person Responsible

Jennifer Guffey (jguffey@gulf.k12.fl.us)

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 works to communicate with stakeholders at all levels to establish a safe and caring learning environment that develops characteristics of a positive attitude, respect, responsibility, self-control, and hard work ethics. All stakeholders involved within the school may reward students with positive office referrals that build upon the six attributes that WES places a focus on listed above.

The guidance counselor also works within classrooms to instruct a program called Safer, Smarter Kids to students that instills the qualities of good friendships and smart choices.

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

Teachers, families, volunteers, guidance counselor, mental health counselor, Florida Department of Health in Gulf County (CHOICES program) all help in promoting a positive school culture and environment. Teachers and families work together to help the students become successful both academically and behaviorally.

Volunteers help promote activities within the school to build a positive climate/environment (book fair, PTO events).

The guidance counselor and mental health counselor work to incorporate and implement the programs to build character and life skills.

The representative from the Florida Department of Health promote goal setting, self-esteem building, developing positive friendships, and avoiding unhealthy relationships.