

Bay District Schools

Cedar Grove Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	11
Budget to Support Goals	13

Cedar Grove Elementary School

2826 E 15TH ST, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2017-18 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">85%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">60%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

Cedar Grove students will be able to think critically, read, write, solve mathematical problems and engage in their environment to gain the skills to become college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cedar Grove is committed to developing confident, capable, literate learners who will be able to function successfully in our 21st century society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Wojnowski, Sheila	Principal
Lilja, Carla	Assistant Principal
Echols, Amanda	Teacher, K-12
Ammons, Yvonne	Teacher, K-12
Libby, Lisa	Teacher, ESE
Richardson, Darlene	Instructional Coach
Gibson, Gloria	Teacher, K-12
Schatzel, Nina	Teacher, K-12
Dunnivant, Michael	Instructional Coach
Baxley, Adrian	Teacher, K-12
Besenyi, Lyndsey	Instructional Media
Lane, Natalina	Teacher, ESE
Emmett, Heidi	Other

Duties

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

The administrative team act as the overseer of instruction/behavior. The school leadership team comprised of general education, ESE, intervention teachers as well as coaches and supplemental staff, will work to design and implement a plan to increase student proficiency in all academic areas and in social behavior.

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	32	30	18	19	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	18	10	11	18	17	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Course failure in ELA or Math	29	23	25	53	49	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	52	43	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	12	5	4	10	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	5	3	1	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	11	1	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 7/25/2018

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	22	14	16	16	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	4	5	10	10	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	13	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	4	5	6	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	22	14	16	16	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	4	5	10	10	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	13	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	4	5	6	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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?

According to the 2018 data, our 4th grade ELA performed at 15% proficiency, the lowest of all grades with third grade at 28% and 5th grade at 32% proficiency for ELA. The year before, 2017, the proficiency was 47% for 4th grade, 44% for 3rd and 33% for 5th in ELA. The 4th grade cohort group dropped 32 percentage points in ELA. At this point the school is trending downward. Suspensions are increasing across grade levels. Kindergarten and 4th grade had a 5 to 6 time increase in suspensions. 1st and 3rd grades doubled or nearly doubled their suspensions in 2018. 2nd and 5th grade had 1 to 3 student increase in suspensions from 2017 to 2018. Attendance in 2018 showed that grades Kinder through 4th grade had a three to 10 student increase in students not attending school. Absences are showing a trend of increasing through the years.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Both ELA and math FSA scores showed a decline. ELA showed a 16%, a 32%, and a 1% decline in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade respectively. In math, 3rd grade had a 3% decline; 4th grade a 14% decline and 5th grade a 22% decline. The greatest decline was found in 3rd and 4th grade ELA. Course failure in ELA/math showed a significant decline in all grade levels. Kindergarten had 0 students failing in 2017, but had 29 with a "D or F" in 2018. 1st grade had 6 students failing in 2017, with 23 students earning "Ds or Fs" in 2018. 2nd and 3rd grade students had 3 students each scoring "Ds or Fs", while in 2018 25 and 53 respectively had "Ds and Fs". 4th and 5th grade had 3 students in each grade scoring "Ds/ Fs" in 2017, but had 49 and 27 course failure in 2018.

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

4th grade ELA had the biggest gap. The state average was 56% proficient, our 4th grade was at 18% proficient. That represented a 41% gap in the two scores.

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

Science showed a 15% point increase from the year before. In 2018 science scores were at 38% proficiency; in 2017 they were at 23% proficient. This component is trending up. In the 2016 school year the science proficiency was 15%.

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

The staff focused on science across grade levels. The district pushed in staff on a biweekly basis to support science implementation. Time was set aside for students to participate in hands on experiments and activities.

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	29%	50%	56%	29%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	35%	49%	55%	32%	47%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	45%	48%	46%	43%	46%
Math Achievement	34%	57%	62%	34%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	37%	57%	59%	27%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	46%	47%	32%	43%	46%
Science Achievement	38%	50%	55%	15%	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	32 (22)	30 (14)	18 (16)	19 (16)	20 (11)	13 (13)	132 (92)
One or more suspensions	18 (4)	10 (5)	11 (10)	18 (10)	17 (3)	9 (6)	83 (38)
Course failure in ELA or Math	29 (0)	23 (6)	25 (3)	53 (3)	49 (3)	27 (3)	206 (18)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	52 (9)	43 (13)	24 (31)	119 (53)

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	28%	57%	-29%	57%	-29%
	2017	44%	59%	-15%	58%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	15%	51%	-36%	56%	-41%
	2017	47%	52%	-5%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-32%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	32%	50%	-18%	55%	-23%
	2017	33%	49%	-16%	53%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	25%	63%	-38%	62%	-37%
	2017	28%	56%	-28%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	31%	59%	-28%	62%	-31%
	2017	45%	62%	-17%	64%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2018	26%	57%	-31%	61%	-35%
	2017	48%	52%	-4%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	34%	54%	-20%	55%	-21%
	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	32	44	56	33	33	29	27				
BLK	19	29	55	28	39	42	31				
HSP	50			42							
MUL	43	30		46							
WHT	31	39	60	36	35	40	41				
FRL	24	27	50	29	28	29	33				

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	21	37	50	27	50	36	5				
BLK	26	49	69	25	43	33	10				
HSP	36			45							
MUL	53	64		53	55						
WHT	48	54		48	72		29				
FRL	40	49	57	33	53	38	15				

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	Standard based instruction (ELA and Math) across grade levels.
Rationale	The data showed there was a 29%(3rd grade) , 41% (4th grade) and 23% (5th grade) deficit in ELA in classes when compared to the state FSA proficiency scores. We also showed a 37% (3rd grade), 31% (4th grade) and 35% (5th grade) shortfall in math when compared to the state FSA scores. When students struggle with the rigor of the standard, their learning is impacted and their chance for success is greatly reduced. Instruction will be monitored and assessment data reviewed to ensure that students are getting the remediation or enrichment they need to learn to the intent of the standard.
Intended Outcome	Students will increase their proficiency in ELA and math by 5% through the added supports and materials that allow students to master skills necessary to learn the concepts that align to the intent of the standard.
Point Person	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Utilize para support in the classroom to allow for small group instruction. *Provide subs, so that instruction is not interrupted. *Purchase materials that align to the standards to expose students to rigorous and challenging instruction. *Add a teacher in 5th grade to provide smaller class size for the cohort that had the greatest decline. * Provide PD in core instruction courses. *Obtain coaches/intervention teachers to support instruction and interventions in the classroom. *Provide after school tutoring to support in ELA/ math instruction. *Monitor Lesson Plans/PLC minutes for high order questions and interventions/enrichment. *Attend/Review data from PLCs to monitor common (formative/summative) assessment data and MAP data to ensure that students are identified that need support and that the interventions/enrichment are provided. * Monitor instruction for implementation of PLC created instruction to include rigorous core and the use of interventions and enrichment utilizing the classroom walk through form (CWT). *After attending PD, staff will be monitored for implementation through lesson plans/PLC minutes. *The use of SRA as the ELA research based curriculum will be monitored through data notebooks.
Person Responsible	Heidi Emmett (emmeth@bay.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	Interventionist/coaches will go to classes regularly to provide interventions, modeling and support to teachers. Data notebooks and PLC minutes will record student progress on assessments.
Person Responsible	Darlene Richardson (richadm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2

Title Behavior/Social Skills development

Rationale Data showed that our attendance issues were up in almost all grades from last year: Kindergarten had 10 more students, 1st grade 16 more, 2nd grade 2 more, 3rd grade 3 more, 4th grade 9 more and 5th grade 0 more students with attendance below 90%. Our suspensions were up as well: kindergarten had 16 more students with 1 suspension than last year. 1st grade had 5 more students, 2nd grade had 1 more, 3rd grade had 8 more, 4th grade had 14 more and 5th grade had 3 more. When students are not in attendance or they are suspended, they are unable to access the curriculum from a teaching professional. This affects their ability to learn complex material and have success in mastering content.

Intended Outcome Student suspensions and attendance issues will decrease by 3 students per grade level from the 2017-18 to the 2018-19 school year as noted by early warning systems (EWS) data.

Point Person Carla Lilja (liljacg@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description

- *Acquire a part time behavior interventionist to work with students on social skills.
- *Acquire a Part time social worker to monitor and work with students and families with chronic absences.
- *Acquire a promise para to assist with social skills, student redirection, and supporting students to stay in school.
- *Purchase Core Essentials as our school wide character education program.
- *Purchase CHAMPS, a positive behavior management system to help reduce student suspensions due to behavior.
- *Provide a parent liaison to assist with parent/community connection to help reduce absences and behaviors.

Person Responsible Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Use the district EWS (early warning system data) to monitor attendance and suspensions. Use CWT to monitor implementation of Core Essentials/CHAMPS. Monthly MTSS data meetings with lead stake holders on student data in regard to behavior. Monthly review of Promise para data on students who utilize the Promise room.

Person Responsible Carla Lilja (liljacg@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.

The school will utilize Back to School Bash, Open House, afternoon/evening Title I and SAC meetings to inform the community about programs and activities planned to support students' needs.

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.

Cedar Grove strives to ensure that the social-emotional needs of all learners are being met. Through the PBIS Team, MTSS and teacher referrals, we provide social skills training for students, as well as a site-based Social Worker, and a behavior interventionist to meet those needs. Interventions will include social skills groups, check-in/check-out, mentors, Zoo-U and the Promise Room.

In addition, Cedar Grove is a participant in the District's Elevate Bay! mentor program. This program involves local churches and businesses in providing mentors and other resources for classrooms and individual students.

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

At Cedar Grove Elementary School, all incoming kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering kindergarten to determine individual and group needs and to assist in the development of robust instructional/intervention programs. The following strategies assist preschoolers with low readiness rates: the state's volunteer Pre-K program, Head Start, and ESE Pre-K are programs that are currently in use to assist preschoolers. Additionally, each school has an Open House/Move In day before school begins. During the Open House/Move In day, students are introduced to the teacher and the school.

Parent involvement and communication regarding transition programs occur at each Title 1 school. Each school provides surveys and newsletters about transition events to incoming kindergarten parents. Other information about transition is provided in the community through information in school newsletters, social media and posters/flyers in the community. There are dedicated funds in Title 1 to address the Pre-K transition strategies outlined above.

The activities start in the spring when children are invited to the school to participate in activities such as visits to classrooms, etc. They can interact with children already in kindergarten. With children in the classroom, the teacher reads a story, has circle time, etc. While the children are visiting the classrooms, the parents receive information on how to enroll their child in the school and how to prepare their child for kindergarten.

To facilitate fifth grade transition to middle school, contact is made with middle schools to schedule a school visit. In the spring, fifth grade students have an opportunity to tour the campus, visit classrooms, and meet the administration. Middle schools also provide an official orientation meeting for incoming students before the official start of school. Other information about transition is provided in the community through information in school newsletters and posters/flyers in the community.

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 School Leadership Team (SLT) meets during the summer to dig into the schools' data portfolio. After identifying the most critical concerns, the team conducts an analysis to determine what is the most efficient and focused strategies for improvement. The results of the analysis drives how resources will be allocated including Title I funds and the school budget.

The SLT, under the leadership of administration meets monthly to analyze data and make any necessary mid-course corrections. All resources are inventoried through the district and site based school media centers.

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

The school partners with the community to host a Career Day at the beginning of the school year to expose students to job opportunities in the community. Mentors provide students with opportunities learn about career options. Plans to visit local vocational and community colleges to expose to career options are also in the works.

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$531,291.75
---------------	---------------------