

Bay District Schools

Deer Point 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 | 8 |
| Title I Requirements | 11 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 13 |

Deer Point Elementary School

4800 HIGHWAY 2321, Panama City, FL 32404

[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 PK-5 | No | 68% |
| 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 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | C | 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.

Deer Point Elementary will work collaboratively to ensure the success of all students through engaging and relevant learning activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Deer Point Anglers are respectful, independent and responsible leaders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Reeder, Rebecca | Principal |
| Knight, Jillian | School Counselor |
| Chapman, Krista | Teacher, K-12 |
| Kolmetz, Susan | Teacher, K-12 |
| Register, Roxanne | Teacher, K-12 |
| Thomason, Stacy | Teacher, K-12 |
| Brock, Russell | Assistant Principal |
| Carter, Susie | |

Duties

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

The school leadership team serves many purposes at Deer Point Elementary School.

All members:

Make data informed decisions for the school and its stakeholders based on a variety of sources.

Plan for the future of the school.

Provide feedback to parents and community partners as needed.

Teachers:

Help make school based decisions.

Help to implement decisions of the school leadership team to their team members and offer support as needed.

Administration/Guidance Counselor

Oversee the implementation of the decisions made by the school leadership team.

Provide resources to the staff to help implement these decisions.

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 | 25 | 30 | 37 | 31 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |
| One or more suspensions | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 26 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

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 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

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 | 30 | 27 | 26 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 26 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

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 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 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 | 30 | 27 | 26 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 26 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

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 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 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?

ELA growth in the lowest quartile was the component that performed the lowest. Lowest quartile growth in Math and ELA is below district and state averages.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Science achievement showed the greatest decline from 60% to 42%.

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

Science achievement showed the biggest gap, 8%.

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

Math learning gains overall improved from 48% to 61%.

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

The transition to the Eureka Math curriculum was the largest change that led to the increase in Math achievement and overall learning gains. Teachers also utilized the lesson preparation protocol outlined by Bay District Schools as a part of the PLC process.

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 | 53% | 50% | 56% | 58% | 48% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 46% | 49% | 55% | 56% | 47% | 52% |

| School Grade Component | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 41% | 45% | 48% | 44% | 43% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 55% | 57% | 62% | 56% | 53% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 61% | 57% | 59% | 46% | 53% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 46% | 47% | 24% | 43% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 42% | 50% | 55% | 57% | 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 (30) | 25 (27) | 30 (26) | 37 (10) | 31 (16) | 27 (15) | 187 (124) |
| One or more suspensions | 5 (6) | 2 (0) | 2 (3) | 1 (1) | 1 (3) | 5 (6) | 16 (19) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (4) | 1 (0) | 2 (0) | 5 (1) | 9 (6) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 26 (6) | 26 (26) | 46 (31) | 98 (63) |

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 | 51% | 57% | -6% | 57% | -6% |
| | 2017 | 68% | 59% | 9% | 58% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -17% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 62% | 51% | 11% | 56% | 6% |
| | 2017 | 45% | 52% | -7% | 56% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 17% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 45% | 50% | -5% | 55% | -10% |
| | 2017 | 56% | 49% | 7% | 53% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 56% | 63% | -7% | 62% | -6% |
| | 2017 | 62% | 56% | 6% | 62% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 63% | 59% | 4% | 62% | 1% |
| | 2017 | 38% | 62% | -24% | 64% | -26% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 25% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 47% | 57% | -10% | 61% | -14% |
| | 2017 | 61% | 52% | 9% | 57% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 45% | 54% | -9% | 55% | -10% |
| | 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 | 30 | 30 | 38 | 41 | 54 | 39 | 20 | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 38 | 38 | 27 | 48 | 50 | | | | | |
| MUL | 65 | 38 | | 76 | 69 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 49 | 42 | 56 | 63 | 43 | 47 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 44 | 39 | 46 | 58 | 37 | 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 | 28 | 44 | 55 | 29 | 38 | 31 | 20 | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 38 | | 33 | 50 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 73 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 42 | 55 | | 47 | 27 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 47 | 47 | 56 | 50 | 45 | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 48 | 48 | 46 | 48 | 40 | 38 | | | | |

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 | ELA/Math Lowest Quartile Students |
| Rationale | Deer Point Elementary is below the District and State averages in lowest quartile students scores on the FSA test. By improving the performance of the lowest 25% of our students, our school will improve its achievement levels in FSA and Math. |
| Intended Outcome | <p>In order to improve the performance of the lowest quartile students, Deer Point Elementary will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile to at least 50%, which is above the state average for the 2017-2018 school year. 2. Increase Math learning gains for the lowest quartile students to at least 50%, which is above the state average for the 2017-2018 school year. |
| Point Person | Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional push-in inclusion ESE teachers to monitor and work with lowest quartile students. 2. MTSS pull out support for those students struggling in ELA and Math 3. MAP testing/monitoring of lowest quartile students. 4. Data chats. |
| Person Responsible | Jillian Knight (knighjk@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | <p>These action steps will be monitored through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Individual periodic teacher data chats with administration 2. Monthly MTSS data chats 3. Classroom observations and feedback to teachers |
| Person Responsible | Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us) |

| Activity #2 | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | Rigorous Instruction |
| Rationale | Student achievement at Deer Point Elementary will increase with the continued implementation of a rigorous instructional model. |
| Intended Outcome | ELA achievement will increase to levels above the state average for the 2017-2018 school year (56%). Math achievement will increase to levels above the state average (62%). |
| Point Person | Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional staff will utilize every instructional minute in the master schedule and meet all expectations as outlined by the District. 2. Use District-designed curriculum guides to plan and prepare for instruction. 3. Implement the Achieve 3000 program (Smarty Ants/Kid Biz) 4. Implement the Bay district Schools curriculum in all subject areas (ELA, Eureka Math, Science, Social Studies) with fidelity each day during specified time in the master schedule. |
| Person Responsible | Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | <p>Action Steps will be monitored in the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classroom walkthrough observations 2. Data chats 3. Monitoring of teacher lesson plans 4. MAP test results 5. Results of district common assessments |
| Person Responsible | Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us) |

| Activity #3 | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | Behavior |
| Rationale | Deer Point students will achieve more and experience greater academic success if classroom disruptions for behavior are limited and all students are in class and participating. Students who are disrupting class not only cause themselves to fall behind, but the rest of the class as well. |
| Intended Outcome | Deer Point teachers wrote 716 disciplinary referrals during the 2017-2018 school year. This year that number will decrease by at least 10%. Incidents of defiance/disrespect and inappropriate behavior (approximately 225 of these referrals, or over 30%) will decrease by 15%. |
| Point Person | Russell Brock (brockwr@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administration will work with teachers to establish classroom managed vs. office managed behaviors. 2. Teachers will align their classroom discipline with school behavior procedures. 3. Teachers will use class dojo to reinforce behavior that meets our CAST expectations. 4. Teachers will implement a classroom reward system to recognize students who are following the CAST expectations. |
| Person Responsible | Russell Brock (brockwr@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | <p>Tracking of ODRs in Focus.</p> <p>Attending PLCs to discuss students who may have disciplinary issues.</p> <p>Monthly MTSS meetings.</p> |
| Person Responsible | Russell Brock (brockwr@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.

Parent partnership in their child's education is paramount at Deer Point Elementary. Administration and teachers communicate with all stakeholders in a variety of ways.

Classroom DOJO, classroom newsletters, Parent Portal, school-wide emails, IRIS alerts, in addition to school and classroom websites, will provide families a variety of means by which they may become informed of school events. Facebook is also used to push out information to parents and community members. Numerous events are planned throughout the year to encourage parents and community to participate and support the school:

- * Musical performances for all grade levels

- * Art nights
- * A fall and a spring Book Fair
- * Thanksgiving and Christmas lunches
- * AFIT (a parent-teacher organization)
- * Market Days - giving students the opportunity to make items for sale to families
- * Anglers on the Run Fun Run (5K, 10K and 1 mile run)
- * STEM Night
- * Chick-Fil-A Spirit Nights, Whataburger, Chill Yogurt Spirit Night throughout the year
- * Spring Festival
- * Community-wide math night

The district's Parent Portal provides families with real-time information regarding student achievement and attendance. Each family is required to establish an account through which they may view students grades and communicate with teachers.

Conferences are regularly scheduled with families to discuss academic, social, behavioral, and attendance concerns. Parent contact is encouraged through a number of methods including Classroom DOJO, Parent Portal, emails, phone and mail.

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.

Counseling is available to students before, during, and after school. Bullying education is provided in the classrooms. Resources for bullying are on the guidance website. Friend Watch is used by each school within our district to provide an outlet for students who are concerned about bullying. A Guidance Mailbox is used by students to communicate concerns or issues with other students or in their home life. Conflict Resolution strategies are taught in the classroom. A Military Counselor is on site to provide counseling for children of military parents. Guidance Counselors provide parents with community resources outside of the school. Community partners help with food, clothing, and mentoring. 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.

MTSS Problem Solving Process:

*Tier 2 Interventions: Social Skills Groups, Zoo-U, Check-In/Check-Out, Mentoring, ISS 360, etc.

*Tier 3 Interventions: Individualized Functional Assessments and Positive Behavioral Intervention Plans

Resources-

*FL Therapy Counselors, Elevate Bay, and Community Partners

*PROMISE Program

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

Regular education teachers work in tandem with preschool teachers to ensure a smooth transition into kindergarten. Onsite preschool teachers attend all faculty meetings and participate in school-wide learning opportunities to ensure that they understand the rigor of Florida Standards and expectations of regular education. Kindergarten students are administered the FLKRS (WSS) assessment and Number Sense Screener to evaluate student readiness. Kindergarten teachers relay information gathered from

the assessments to preschool teachers for future improvements in curriculum. At the end of each year, Pre-K students rotate through the kindergarten classrooms in order to familiarize themselves with the new surroundings, expectations, and teachers.

Fifth grade students are given the opportunity to participate in middle school visits to become familiar with the campus and expectations. Transition meetings are held at the end of each school year to ensure that student needs will be met in their new school setting.

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 problem-solving process: plan, act, do is recursive. Data will be used to drive decisions and determine goals for the SIP. Data used will consist of FSA ELA/Math, Science, MAP, DAR, John's, etc.

Title II: Bay District Schools Office of Staff Development provides the school with staff development opportunities, materials, and resources related to increasing student achievement as requested. Bay District Schools Office of Staff Development also provides Staff Training Specialists to deliver staff development for instructional staff and administrators.

Title III: District funds are used to provide supplemental materials and computer software to support English Language Learners (ELL).

Title X: Bay District provides resources for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

| | |
|--------|--------|
| Total: | \$0.00 |
|--------|--------|