G. Weaver Hipps Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

G. Weaver Hipps Elementary School

1200 HOMESTEAD RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

http://hpe.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Deborah Nauss

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (36%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

G. Weaver Hipps Elementary School

1200 HOMESTEAD RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

http://hpe.leeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**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	No	87%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of G Weaver Hipps Elementary is to prepare all students to read and comprehend at high levels.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
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
Nauss, Deborah	Principal	
Miller, Andrew	Assistant Principal	
Lewis-Clarke, Lenora	Instructional Coach	PLC (Peer Collaborative Teacher)
Ledford, Dawn	Reading Coach	Primary Literacy Coach
	Reading Coach	Literacy Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/16/2022, Deborah Nauss

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
59

Total number of students enrolled at the school
827

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
16

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
18

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	121	133	132	155	120	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	831
Attendance below 90 percent	60	61	56	59	46	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	348
One or more suspensions	4	4	4	6	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	12	54	59	43	6	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
Course failure in Math	9	17	21	33	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	72	58	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	70	55	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	37	77	80	35	30	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	304

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	35	31	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/16/2022

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	8	28	32	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	8	28	32	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	34%	52%	56%				45%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	42%						51%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%						48%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	34%	45%	50%				49%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	42%						44%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						30%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	59%	59%				36%	52%	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	47%	58%	-11%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	54%	61%	-7%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	62%	-17%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	58%	-19%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	50%	-15%	53%	-18%
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	8	21	22	15	30	27	6				
ELL	23	27	14	24	31	35	23				
BLK	34	48		34	42		48				
HSP	31	39	30	32	41	31	35				
MUL	36	29		15	23						
WHT	40	53	55	44	52		40				
FRL	32	39	34	29	40	31	39				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8	38	50	21	31	27	25				
ELL	14	33	44	27	29	36	9				
BLK	31	38		39	50		20				
HSP	33	41	45	33	24	20	32				
MUL	59			59							
WHT	53	72		56	47		68				
FRL	31	41	55	32	27	28	33				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	31	33	18	32	39	6				
ELL	28	45	50	35	44	32	33				
BLK	41	42	31	39	31	29	16				
HSP	42	53	50	48	44	22	40				
MUL	53	55		40	55						
WHT	60	53		64	53		38				
FRL	44	50	51	43	40	28	31				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	307
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	46
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	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	26
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	47
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 trends show a decrease from 20/21 to 21/22.
ELA prof - dropped from 37% to 34%
ELA LG- dropped from 45% to 42%
ELA L25- dropped from 52% to 34%
Math trends show a decrease from 20/21 to 21/22.
Math Prof- dropped from 38% to 34%
Math LG- increase from 32% to 42%
Math L25- increase from 28% to 30%
Science trends show an slight increase from 37% to 39%

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

ELA L25 dropped from 52% to 34%

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

Contributing factors include:
-Attendance
-Gaps in learning
-Teacher efficacy
New Actions to be taken:
-Deliberate practice in PLCs
-Training
-Monitoring

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

Math LG combined grades 3-5 increased from 32% to 42%.

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

Math coach provided additional support through additional whole group instruction during specials. Fall tutoring focused on Math. The math coach led a individual competition using the Reflex Math program to focus on math fact fluency.

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

Focus on unpacking the BEST Standards and aligning instruction with the standards and the pacing guide. Backwards design planning through PLC supported by leadership and administration. Purchase of ELA and Math intervention materials (BEST Standards Math(Grades K-5) and Magnetic Reading (Grades 3-5)-- iReady).

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.

Training on backwards design and unpacking/understanding the BEST standards. Training on high yield instructional strategies/ Art and Science of Teaching. Training on Kagan structures. Kagan SEL and brain research.

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

Schoolwide expectations communicated throughout the year. Ongoing professional development for all employees. Regular monitoring of implementation in the classroom with feedback provided to teachers by admin and the leadership team. Planning will be collaborative and supported by leadership and admin.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	With the new BEST standards, new state assessments, and new district adopted curriculum, we must retrain all stakeholders in planning and delivery of instruction. Teachers struggle to break down standards in order to deliver rigorous, aligned instruction. By purchasing standards based materials, providing teachers with ongoing training, and giving specific feedback on observed instruction, student performance will increase. All 11 new teachers and any teacher identified as needing Tier 3 level support will have a minimum of 1 six week coaching cycle with school level coaches, PCT, and district level LLT. Our school will focus on the backwards design planning with coaches/admin support that is aligned to standards, together they will work on the delivery of instruction is as planned, and the evidence of learning will be demonstrated by mastery of standards and will be reviewed as a team.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Student proficiency in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science on the State Assessment Cambium will improve ELA increase from 34% to 45% Math increase from 34% to 45% Science increase from 39% to 45%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Each grade level PLC will administer the district standards based exemplar exams and quarterly comprehensive tests. Results will be reviewed as a PLC with administration and leadership to identify mastery of the standards, discuss best practices, and design intervention on a student by student basis.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Nauss (deborahnaus@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	Teachers will utilize Backwards Design Lesson Planning through the PLC process to ensure the standards are taught at the appropriate level of rigor. Teachers will use the state assessment blueprints, take the district progress monitoring exams prior to planning and instruction, and use the district Instructional and Pacing Guides to design lessons of high quality as a grade level collaborative team. Then they will review the assessment results after the are the students have taken them to determine what they need to do for intervention and enrichment. Administration will conduct frequent walk-thru and provide

implemented for this Area of Focus.	feedback to instructional staff. These will include "look-fors" that were identified during the PLC collaborative team planning.
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 specific strategy is so that teachers are informed of the requirements and specific skills that the students need in order to obtain mastery. Teachers will be providing time to plan for instruction, intervention, and enrichment in their collaborative groups. Teachers are in need of retraining on Backwards Design Planning and on breaking down the standards to ensure everything is in alignment.

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.

Implementation of training on the BEST Standards, backwards design, high yield instructional practices, and the PLC process to our leadership team and grade level chairpersons who facilitate grade level planning. After the facilitators are training, they will provide ongoing training and support to the teachers.

Person Responsible Deborah Nauss (deborahnaus@leeschools.net)

Administration will schedule frequent walk throughs to observe teaching and learning. This process will allow admin to provide authentic feedback on instruction and also identify teacher strengths and areas in need of support. This tiered level of support will be shared with the academic coaches to provide additional training and feedback using the coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Deborah Nauss (deborahnaus@leeschools.net)

As the district standards based progress monitoring exams are given, teachers will convene to analyze the results to determine next steps. Teams will determine if intervention groups need to change. Students will be invited to after school tutoring to get additional standards based intervention in ELA. Additional intervention time during the school day during specials by academic coaches and teachers. Additional materials will be purchased for intervention based on the level of student need.

Person Responsible Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

1. Develop a list of school based "look fors" before, during, and after planning.
2. Identify coach to support each grade level team.
3. Train coach and grade level chairperson in the backward design planning process and "look fors" that will be evidence of aligned instruction.
4. Model standards based alignment lesson planning using the backward design model during grade level planning session.

4- Model standards based alignment lesson planning using the backward design model during grade level planning session.

| **Person Responsible** | Deborah Nauss (deborahnaus@leeschools.net) |

No description entered

| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

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

K- 62% of students Level 1-2 at the end of 21/22 and will decrease to 55% by the end of 22/23 iReady.
1- 69% of students Level 1-2 at the end of 21/22 and will decrease to 55% by the end of 22/23 iReady.
2- 71% of students Level 1-2 at the end of 21/22 and will decrease to 55% by the end of 22/23 iReady.

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

3- 62% of students Level 1-2 at the end of 21/22 and will decrease to 55% by the end of 22/23 iReady.
4- 69% of students Level 1-2 at the end of 21/22 and will decrease to 55% by the end of 22/23 iReady.
5- 71% of students Level 1-2 at the end of 21/22 and will decrease to 55% by the end of 22/23 iReady.

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)

K- 38% of students proficient at the end of 21/22 and will increase to 45% by the end of 22/23 on iReady.
1- 31% of students proficient at the end of 21/22 and will increase to 40% by the end of 22/23 on iReady.
2- 29% of students proficient at the end of 21/22 and will increase to 40% by the end of 22/23 on iReady.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

3- 29% of students proficient at the end of 21/22 FSA and will increase to 45% by the end of 22/23 on Cambium.
4- 29% of students proficient at the end of 21/22 FSA and will increase to 45% by the end of 22/23 on Cambium.
5- 41% of students proficient at the end of 21/22 FSA and will increase to 45% by the end of 22/23 on Cambium.

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.

Administrators will participate in the grade levels' collaborative planning time, we will develop "Looks Fors" based on the instructional guides, assessments will be monitored in the Performance Matters platform, I-Ready assessments, and we will also monitor and have data chats with classroom teachers on the Cambium assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Nauss, Deborah, deborahnaus@leeschools.net

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?

The identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based as strong. The Wonders curriculum is a researched based curriculum that is based on the B.E.S.T. standards and benchmarks which are slated to align with the FAST and STAR assessments for students.

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?

The evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need for 45% of our students in grades 3 to 5 to score proficient on the FAST assessment.

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
The leadership team will be briefed on the Area of Focus they align with the SIP Plan then the leadership team will discuss the Area of Focus with their grade level team. The teams will meet to plan using backwards design lesson planning after taking the assessments which will be used to track the students mastery. This is provide the team with clear insight on what the students need to knew to obtain mastery in the Focus Areas.	Nauss, Deborah, deborahnaus@leeschools.net

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 addresses the building of a positive school culture and environment through its PBIS program, the Leader in Me, Kagan SEL practices, and the school's Sunshine club activities.

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

PBIS: GWH PBIS Team
Leader in Me: GWH Lighthouse Team
Kagan SEL: GWH Kagan Teach Back Team
Sunshine Club: GWH Sunshine Committee