Wewahitchka High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wewahitchka High School

1 GATOR CIR, Wewahitchka, FL 32465

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jay Bidwel

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
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)	91%
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 (51%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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 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

Wewahitchka High School

1 GATOR CIR, Wewahitchka, FL 32465

[no web address on file]

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)
High School 7-12	Yes	91%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

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.

Preparing students today for the needs of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to inspire and empower our students to reach the highest levels of personal growth by providing a wide variety of extraordinary educational, cultural, social and athletic experiences in a safe, caring, nurturing environment.

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
Bidwell, Jay	Principal	To lead the school in all facets including areas related to the academic, social, extra-curricular, facilities, safety, etc. of school operation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 6/1/2014, Jay Bidwel

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
24

Total number of students enrolled at the school
368

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
2

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	63	61	77	56	67	48	373
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	26	32	23	33	20	164
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	17	22	20	11	7	92
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	12	7	7	6	6	57
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	9	1	2	3	32
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	18	38	22	19	7	127
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	29	13	9	4	93
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	33	22	20	14	4	122
	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	0	1	27	24	31	24	20	12	139

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	3	2	1	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/29/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	75	60	70	51	50	364
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	25	27	37	14	18	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4	1	2	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	11	19	7	4	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	9	3	4	6	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	31	19	16	10	10	102
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	33	11	12	6	6	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	38	22	22	8	8	122

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	11	21	18	23	9	9	91

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	75	60	70	51	50	364
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	25	27	37	14	18	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4	1	2	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	11	19	7	4	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	9	3	4	6	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	31	19	16	10	10	102
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	33	11	12	6	6	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	38	22	22	8	8	122

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	11	21	18	23	9	9	91

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	40%		51%				51%		56%
ELA Learning Gains	42%						47%		51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						40%		42%
Math Achievement	33%		38%				51%		51%
Math Learning Gains	45%						34%		48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						24%		45%
Science Achievement	39%		40%				59%		68%
Social Studies Achievement	56%		48%				65%		73%

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**
07	2022					
	2019	47%	45%	2%	52%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	47%	49%	-2%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	50%	47%	3%	48%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	58%	50%	8%	67%	-9%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	71%	67%	4%	71%	0%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	54%	55%	-1%	70%	-16%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	54%	56%	-2%	61%	-7%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	67%	-16%	57%	-6%

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	16	30	28	14	29	38	11	26		90	
BLK	21	18		13	41	40	17	53			
WHT	44	46	36	36	45	52	45	59	85	86	53
FRL	30	38	32	28	43	48	39	47		86	38
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	22	40	33	20	39	44	36	37			
BLK	30	52	50	5	25	36		43		67	
WHT	51	46	35	48	39	44	64	66	69	78	74
FRL	39	40	31	31	33	42	58	59	58	66	68
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	30	45	52	26	27	20	25	42		92	27
BLK	50	42		36	24		27	71			
WHT	52	48	35	53	35	26	65	64	79	86	60
FRL	40	42	40	43	31	23	51	57	80	74	57

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
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	53
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	43
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?

A general downward trend in all areas except math learning gains and L25% math learning gains.

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

7th grade math, 8th grade ELA

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

We replaced 14 out of 24 teachers in the last 14 months. Many of the teachers that left were highly adept teachers with typically strong FSA scores and out new teachers were, by and large, quite inexperienced. Many were rookies with no education background, and several started in the middle of the academic year. We lost over 260 years of combined experience and replaced it with less than 20 combined years of experience. Nine of our new 14 teachers came with no experience and one other one came with 2 years of experience several years ago.

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

Math learning gains and L25% math learning gains.

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

We are finally moving on from a major hurricane which caused long term school closures and absenteeism and the COVID years, which exacerbated the issues.

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

We will need to continue to train our new teachers and they will need to continue to hone their craft. We have re-configured our schedule to help as well. Last year we had some teachers instructing ELA and math and now we have concentrated their areas.

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.

Most of our new teachers attended the rural connect workshop at PAEC this past summer. We also have bi-monthly reflection sessions for first and second year teachers in which they share challenges and successes, ask questions, work on lesson planning, etc. In light of the preponderance of new teachers throughout the district, our school board created a new administrative position dedicated solely to supporting newer teachers.

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

The new administrative position for supporting newer teachers will be in place for the next couple of years at least, and this administrator will continue to support newer teachers through mentoring, observation, training, etc.

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 Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	As measured by the 2022 FSA, only 19% of our 7th graders demonstrated proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	As measured by the 2023 FSA, at least 40% of our 7th graders will demonstrate proficiency.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	WHS will use progress monitoring in the fall and winter. Also, our students who struggled in math last year have been assigned a mentor to monitor their progress on a weekly basis.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Our district data specialist/math coach will meet regularly with our math teachers for data analysis and training.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Our data specialist/math coach is a long-time, high-impact math teacher as measured by VAM scores, and she is an excellent teacher-trainer.

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.

WHS will change the schedule so that our new math teachers will only have to instruct math, not math and ELA , so that the focus can be on that one subject only. Our district has schedules 6 half-days for trainings and our math teachers will have access to the math coach on those days.

Person Responsible	Jay Bidwell (jbidwell@gulf.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. 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.	8th grade ELA scores on the FSA were 28%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	As measured by the 2023 FSA, at least 40% of all 8th graders will demonstrate proficiency.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Progress monitoring in the fall and winter. Struggling students have been assigned a mentor who will check on their progress on a weekly basis.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jay Bidwell (jbidwell@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Our 10th grade ELA teacher has had excellent success with her students on the FSA for the past several years. She and our ELA chair will host an in-service for our middle school ELA teachers detailing her methods and activities with a focus on taking a step away from so much technology. Analyzing trends and concerns in the progress monitoring data. Intensive reading students will have additional progress monitoring every two weeks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Having proven, highly effective teachers pass on their tricks of the trade is one of the most impactful ways to train other teachers. This teacher-trainer is well-respected by her peers and they will take her methods back to their classrooms.

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.

1. Utilize our first half-day training for the initial ELA in-service.
2. Utilize subsequent half-day trainings to reflect on new instructional practices and analysis of progress monitoring.
3. Arrange for our district reading coach to come to subsequent half day trainings to aid in spotting trends and areas of concern.

4. Provide training on progress monitoring tools for the teachers of our intensive readers.
.

Person Responsible   Jay Bidwell (jbidwell@gulf.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Twenty incoming 7th graders and seventeen 8th graders have failed math and/or ELA.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	At least 80% of these students will pass both ELA and math this year.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Grades and retention data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jay Bidwell (jbidwell@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	WHS has added a student service coordinator. One of his major duties is to monitor and mentor our middle school at risk students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	By keeping a constant watch on the academic progress, discipline and attendance data for each child who is at risk, we can implement interventions immediately when a need arises, thus giving our students a better chance at success.

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.

1. District created a student services coordinator position.
2. Administration creates a mentoring schedule for coordinator.
3. Coordinator will maintain a file on each at risk student which includes academic, attendance and discipline information.
4. Coordinator will meet at least weekly with each student.
5. Administration will meet to debrief with coordinator at progress report and report card times.
6. Administration, coordinator and teachers will create a plan to help students who are trending in a negative direction.

Person Responsible   Jay Bidwell (jbidwell@gulf.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.

1.Principal encourages and expects all staff to help create a positive environment.
2. We have diversified our course offering over the past several years to include many fine arts and vocational classes.
3. Pep rally incentive program to raise school spirit.
4. Academic rewards program to reward student achievement.
5. Continuing to improve our outside eating and play areas.
6. Movie trip for academic and attendance rewards.
7. Implemented a hope ambassadors program.
8. Implemented a middle school mentoring program.
9. Improved our mental health program.

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

Jay Bidwell, principal - devise vision for a positive school culture and environment.
April Bostwick and Chevon Johns, principal designees - support the principal in the implementation of a positive school culture.
Karen Shiver, guidance counselor - strong advocate for students in all facets of their school life.
Teachers and para professionals - make first contact with students every day in a positive manner
Ashley Forehand, school secretary - meets and greets all students and visitors in a pleasant, welcoming way
Meleah Smith, licensed mental health counselor - deals with students, regardless of the circumstances, in a caring, positive way.