Hutchison Beach Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hutchison Beach Elementary School

12900 MIDDLE BEACH RD, Panama City, FL 32407

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	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	34%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	B	C	B*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay 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.

We are dedicated to developing lifelong leaders. We strive to improve the quality of student performance within a safe environment. We facilitate students as they develop educational and personal goals. Our students are emerging leaders who will meet the challenges of a global society.

We believe and follow our "SPLASH" Pledge. Beach Dolphins are SAFE, POLITE, LEADERS, ACHIEVING, SUCCESS at HBES. Go Dolphins!!!!

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a community of leaders. We recognize, honor, and celebrate the leaders within us all!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Nouskhajian, Glenda	Principal
Marino, Erica	Teacher, K-12
Adkins, Chasity	Teacher, K-12
Fitzgerald, Lori	Teacher, K-12
Wroblewski, Cheri	Assistant Principal
Bunk, Malori	School Counselor
Asselin, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12
Folsom, Susan	Teacher, K-12
Grathwohl, Erika	Teacher, K-12
Valle, Camille	Teacher, ESE
Stem, Shannon	Teacher, K-12
West, Christopher	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Principal - Glenda Nouskhajian
Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. She monitors lesson plans and meets with the teachers to monitor the academic progress of all students. Mrs. Nouskhajian is responsible for the teacher and support evaluations per Bay District schools. She also relays important district initiatives to the staff in a timely manner. Mrs. Nouskhajian meets with the SAC and Instructional Leadership Team.

Assistant Administrator- Cheri Wroblewski
Cheri works along with Mrs. Nouskhajian to make sure that all the teachers have the needed resources to teach effective lessons. She creates the Master Schedule and schedules all special events throughout the year. Cheri also helps the teachers with discipline referrals. She meets with students and contacts the parents when students have had a discipline referral. Cheri meets with the SAC and Instructional Leadership Team.

Guidance Counselors- Malori Bunk and Natasha Turner
Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; supports schools with the implementation of MTSS; shares information with administrators, provides professional development to faculty and staff based on area of need; attends School Based Leadership Team Meetings; assists with data analysis and development of intervention plans and periodically reviews MTSS folders for compliance.

Teachers: Erica Marino, Chasity Walker, Lori Fitzgerald, Stephanie Asselin, Christopher West, Shannon Stem, Erika Grothwohl, Camille Valle, Susan Folsom and Kasen Hicks
Provides guidance on K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan and on implementing new Eureka Math Curriculum; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	37	41	29	22	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	4	4	10	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	12	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	24	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	1	6	8	9	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	9	6	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	13	3	3	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

Date this data was collected

Friday 6/1/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	33	14	14	14	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	5	2	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	1	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	1	1	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	33	14	14	14	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	5	2	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	1	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	1	1	4	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The data component that performed the lowest from the prior year was the lowest 25% of mathematics gains. This dramatic decrease is not a trend. Typically the percentage is around 42%.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the lowest 25% of mathematics gains.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component that had the biggest gap compared to state average was in the lowest 25% of mathematics gains.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component that showed the most improvement was in the area of mathematics achievement. That same area has shown improvement in the last 3 years.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The implementation of new math curriculum may have led to the 1% learning gain in this area.

School Data
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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	50%	56%	45%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	49%	55%	43%	47%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	45%	48%	42%	43%	46%
Math Achievement	62%	57%	62%	55%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	45%	57%	59%	55%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	46%	47%	40%	43%	46%
Science Achievement	56%	50%	55%	49%	44%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	37 (33)	41 (14)	29 (14)	22 (14)	26 (14)	24 (12)	179 (101)
One or more suspensions	4 (5)	4 (2)	10 (1)	4 (1)	5 (1)	7 (4)	34 (14)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	5 (4)	12 (1)	1 (3)	3 (4)	0 (2)	21 (14)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	21 (5)	24 (17)	31 (21)	76 (43)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	61%	57%	4%	57%	4%

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
	2017	66%	59%	7%	58%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	57%	51%	6%	56%	1%	
	2017	50%	52%	-2%	56%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison		-9%					
05	2018	54%	50%	4%	55%	-1%	
	2017	54%	49%	5%	53%	1%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		4%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2018	65%	63%	2%	62%	3%	
	2017	63%	56%	7%	62%	1%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	52%	59%	-7%	62%	-10%	
	2017	67%	62%	5%	64%	3%	
Same Grade Comparison		-15%					
Cohort Comparison		-11%					
05	2018	58%	57%	1%	61%	-3%	
	2017	45%	52%	-7%	57%	-12%	
Same Grade Comparison		13%					
Cohort Comparison		-9%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2018	54%	54%	0%	55%	-1%	
	2017						
Cohort Comparison							

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	34	31	37	29	25	24				
ELL	45	62	62	42	24	18					
BLK	58			50							

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
HSP	44	55	54	42	28	8	46				
MUL	57	50		54	55						
WHT	63	57	50	68	48	28	61				
FRL	57	57	56	60	43	26	51				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	35	55	56	34	41	29	24				
ELL	31	67	67	31	44	43					
BLK				40							
HSP	36	62		42	54	50	36				
MUL	86			71							
WHT	65	62	64	66	60	35	72				
FRL	55	61	67	51	51	44	60				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Mathematics - Learning Gains
Rationale	The dramatic decrease from 42% to 26% in the lowest 25 percentile in mathematics as well as the decrease from 58% to 41% in learning gains in math is the rationale for this focus.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is increase our lowest 25 percentile students on the math FSA from 26% to 60% as well as to increase learning gains for all students to 60% in math.
Point Person	Malori Bunk (bunkmj@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	Identify students that are in this group and establish baseline data points using prior FSA as well as the Fall MAP assessment. Once this is established we will be meeting monthly to discuss each student, look for trends in the data and make adjustments as needed to ensure success. PLC teams are meeting weekly to discuss students, common assessments will guide instruction and serve as monthly data for remediation and enrichment. In addition we are conducting monthly data meetings, with vertical alignment, to ensure that all members of our staff are aware of all students and our progress toward the goal.
Person Responsible	Malori Bunk (bunkmj@bay.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Along with weekly PLC meetings within the grade levels, the MTSS team will be meeting once monthly with administration and district support. Student data will also be discussed at the monthly data chat meetings, additional levels of support will be determined and teachers and paraprofessionals will be targeting these students to help guide instruction of skills that students have not mastered yet. Teachers will be identifying any additional students as well as noting all interventions being done daily on their lesson plans. Paraprofessionals have been assigned to grade levels so that they have a relationship with students and teachers to help with this process.
Person Responsible	Cheri Wroblewski (wroblcl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Attendance and Behavior
Rationale	The rationale for this focus is that our attendance below 90% went from 101 students in 2016-2017 to 173 in 2017-2018. Our student population grew from 540 in the 2016-2017 school year to 602 in the 2017-2018 school year. This means that we went from 18% of our students with attendance below 90% in 2016-2017 to 29% in 2017-2018.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome for this focus is to increase student attendance by 10%. We currently have about the same number of students as we did for the 2017-2018 school year for comparison.
Point Person	Cheri Wroblewski (wroblcl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Guidance and our parent liaison will be working with families by making phone calls when attendance is noted, making recommendations for services, when appropriate, to the district office and reducing individual family barriers to ensure that students are at school when possible. All students, grade Kdg - 5th, will also participate in a morning classroom meeting. This time is reserved for character education, building relationships with students and identifying individual student needs and strengths. Attendance celebrations take place monthly during lunch and students are recognized, in front of their peers, for being at school every day.
Person Responsible	Glenda Nouskhajian (nouskgt@bay.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	PLC teams will report to administration and guidance any student needs or attendance concerns. Reports in FOCUS will be pulled to monitor average daily attendance. Reports will also be acted upon by the parent liaison and guidance. Administration will be walking classrooms in the AM to ensure that the meetings are taking place.
Person Responsible	Cheri Wroblewski (wroblcl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

We plan on building relationships with all stakeholders by hosting parent events, both in the AM and PM, having open lines of communication, and creating a welcoming procedure for all incoming parents and students.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Our school has two full-time Guidance Counselors who work with teachers, parents, and students to attend to the social, emotional, and academic welfare of all children. These counselors routinely meet with small groups and individual students to provide students with strategies to deal with challenging situations. Our parent liaison will also oversee the Watch DOG program, which enlists male parents to act as mentors to our students. Our school also partners with businesses and organizations in the community to provide adult mentors for students. The mentoring program is overseen by the guidance department and mentoring sessions occur regularly throughout the year. We have a Military Family Life Counselor who also works with military related personnel and their dependents.

-Tier 2 Interventions: Social Skills Group, Zoo-U, Check-In/Check-Out, Mentoring, etc.
-Tier 3 Interventions: Individualized Functional Behavioral Assessments & Positive Behavioral Intervention Plans

We ensure that the social-emotional needs of students are met by implementing positive behavior supports school-wide. In addition, the Leader in Me program provides each student with a framework to identify personal strengths and weaknesses and the skills to set goals and employ strategies to meet those goals.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

All incoming Kindergarten students at Beach Elementary School are assessed using the FLKRS/ECHOS and MAP Assessments. This data will be used to plan daily academic instruction for all students and for groups of students or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Transition activities begin with Pre-K students interacting with Kindergarten students throughout the year as appropriate. These activities may include visits of Pre-K students to the K classroom, parental activities, and orientation.

In addition visits for 5th grade to the feeder middle school are provided to aware the students of the next step in their academic career.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The MTSS team will meet to build consensus and make decisions about implementation. The MTSS team functions to conduct on-going MAP, FSA / FCAT Science data, and other Universal Screening data to match interventions to student needs and stakeholder accountability. We will review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting or exceeding benchmarks and students who are at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the MTSS team will identify and ensure professional development. The MTSS team is responsible for school-wide implementation. The MTSS team provides training and coaching to school staff. School administrators will use individual student performance data to determine activities and the MTSS structures needed to best meet the needs of their students. The MTSS process will be integrated in the District Reading Plan, District Student Progression Plan, and School Improvement Plan.

Title I, Part A funds are coordinated with federal, state, and local funds and services to provide high quality supplemental instruction and support services for educationally disadvantaged students at

schools with 63% or more students qualifying for the Free/Reduced Lunch Program. The purpose of Title I funding is to implement programs and services that ensure that all children have a fair, equal and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state academic assessments. Title I, Part A funds and various other funds are coordinated and integrated to provide services for private schools, local neglected and delinquent institutions, and Homeless Programs.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Mentors from local businesses and the area military bases partner with struggling students to provide them with academic support. These mentors share information about college and career readiness based on their profession.

Community business partners are invited to participate in SAC.

Part V: Budget	
Total:	$171,644.00