Bay District Schools

Hiland Park Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Hiland Park Elementary School

2507 E BALDWIN RD, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Fa IR Cloth Ilea

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2019

| 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 |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 91% |
| 2018-19 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 | 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (38%) 2014-15: D (40%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | rmation* |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| ESSA Status | TS&I |
|--|--|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo | or more information, <u>click here</u> . |

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 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

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| | |
| School Information | 7 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| | |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| | |
| Title I Requirements | 19 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Hiland Park Elementary School

2507 E BALDWIN RD, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Gra (per MSID F | | 2018-19 Title I School | Disadvan | 9 Economically taged (FRL) Rate rted on Survey 3) |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|--|
| Elementary So PK-5 | chool | Yes | | 81% |
| Primary Servic (per MSID F | • • | Charter School | (Report | 9 Minority Rate ed as Non-white n Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Ed | lucation | No | | 50% |
| School Grades Histor | У | | | |
| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |

С

C

D

School Board Approval

Grade

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

C

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.

Every Child, Every Day!

The mission of Hiland Park Elementary is to develop the whole child by empowering leaders and creating an atmosphere of excellence and happiness.

Each day, our students recite our LEAD Pledge. At Hiland Park Elementary we are:

Learning Together

Empowering Others

Achieving Goals

Discovering Our Potential

Updated Summer 2019

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to prepare lifelong learners to be productive members of society and to own their future. #HPELeads

Updated Summer 2019

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Faircloth, llea | Principal | As principal, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As administrators, it is our responsibility to guide conversations |
| | | about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and provide shared leadership opportunities. |
| Frowert, Lora | Assistant | As assistant administrator, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. |
| | Principal | As administrators, it is our responsibility to guide conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and provide shared leadership opportunities. |
| Pitts, Angela | Other | As a SLP/teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. |
| Titto, Angela | Other | As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities. |
| McNeal, Jaclyn | Teacher, | As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. |
| McNeal, Jaciyii | K-12 | As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities. |
| Donatiff Kally | Teacher, | As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. |
| Pontiff, Kelly | K-12 | As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities. |
| Museor Torono | Teacher, | As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. |
| Musser, Teresa | K-12 | As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------------|----------|--|
| Davis, Kristal | Teacher, | As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. |
| Davis, Mistai | ESE | As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities. |
| Scola, Gigi | Teacher, | As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. |
| ocola, digi | K-12 | As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities. |
| Proland Stave | Teacher, | As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. |
| Breland, Steve | K-12 | As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities. |
| Daggett Malania | Teacher, | As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. |
| Baggett, Melanie | K-12 | As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities. |
| faircim@bay.k12.fl.us, | Teacher, | As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. |
| Jennifer | K-12 | As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities. |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 86 | 71 | 77 | 84 | 71 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 470 | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | | |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 8 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | |

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

45

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/13/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 57 | 35 | 22 | 27 | 35 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 16 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 16 | 8 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 54 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | | |

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

| Indicator | | | | | (| Grad | e L | eve | el | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|----|---|---|----|----|------|-----|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 12 | 8 | 5 | 27 | 31 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 57 | 35 | 22 | 27 | 35 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 |
| One or more suspensions | | 6 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 16 | 8 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | | 0 | 0 | 47 | 54 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 12 | 8 | 5 | 27 | 31 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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 | | 2019 | 2018 | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | 43% | 55% | 57% | 49% | 49% | 55% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 52% | 59% | 58% | 52% | 54% | 57% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 62% | 57% | 53% | 49% | 55% | 52% | |
| Math Achievement | 44% | 56% | 63% | 42% | 52% | 61% | |
| Math Learning Gains | 46% | 54% | 62% | 42% | 55% | 61% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 32% | 42% | 51% | 28% | 48% | 51% | |
| Science Achievement | 41% | 53% | 53% | 38% | 44% | 51% | |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--|--|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 86 (0) | 71 (0) | 77 (0) | 84 (0) | 71 (0) | 81 (0) | 470 (0) | | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 (57) | 14 (35) | 16 (22) | 18 (27) | 12 (35) | 14 (27) | 95 (203) | | | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 (16) | 7 (6) | 2 (5) | 1 (7) | 9 (11) | 8 (11) | 28 (56) | | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 1 (16) | 4 (8) | 4 (17) | 3 (8) | 7 (6) | 19 (55) | | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 9 (47) | 19 (54) | 28 (34) | 56 (135) | | | |

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| | | | ELA | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 47% | 61% | -14% | 58% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 57% | -12% | 57% | -12% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 43% | 58% | -15% | 58% | -15% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 51% | -17% | 56% | -22% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | -2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 39% | 56% | -17% | 56% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 50% | -1% | 55% | -6% |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | • | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 5% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 48% | 62% | -14% | 62% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 63% | -10% | 62% | -9% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 48% | 59% | -11% | 64% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 43% | 59% | -16% | 62% | -19% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | -5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 30% | 54% | -24% | 60% | -30% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 57% | 0% | 61% | -4% |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | -13% | | | | |

| | | | SCIENCE | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 35% | 54% | -19% | 53% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 54% | -7% | 55% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| | 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 | 24 | 39 | | 15 | 32 | 23 | 29 | | | | | |

| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 |
| ELL | 40 | | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 39 | 67 | 20 | 28 | 38 | 15 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 75 | | 43 | 58 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 44 | 36 | | 39 | 29 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 56 | 53 | 54 | 54 | 27 | 51 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 50 | 58 | 42 | 45 | 38 | 36 | | | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | • |
| 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 | 18 | 23 | 22 | 24 | 30 | 19 | 6 | | | | |
| ELL | 9 | | | 36 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 60 | | | 90 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 39 | 38 | 35 | 47 | 32 | 21 | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 24 | | 43 | 44 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | 41 | | 48 | 63 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 55 | 53 | 59 | 60 | 18 | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 43 | 42 | 48 | 51 | 22 | 48 | | | | |
| | | 2017 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 15 | 42 | 40 | 13 | 31 | 25 | 5 | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 42 | 43 | 26 | 40 | 23 | 17 | | | | |
| HSP | 65 | 50 | | 62 | 53 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 59 | 79 | | 39 | 33 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 53 | 52 | 48 | 43 | 38 | 48 | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 49 | 47 | 37 | 41 | 28 | 30 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 373 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 27 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 44 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 32 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 58 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 37 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|--|-----|
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 49 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 45 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

In looking at our data, students with disabilities performed at 27%. There are several contributing factors such as Hurricane Michael, enrollment decrease resulting in staff changes, and the emotional state of the students and staff.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

In looking at our data, the largest decrease occurred in math specifically 5th grade down 27% for the grade level and 13% decrease in the cohort. There are several contributing factors such as Hurricane Michael, enrollment decrease resulting in staff changes, and the emotional state of the students and staff.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

In looking at our data, the greatest gap compared to the state average was Math Achievement and Math Lowest 25% both at -19 points. There are several contributing factors such as Hurricane Michael, enrollment decrease resulting in staff changes, and the emotional state of the students and staff.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELA Lowest 25% showed the most improvement to 62%. We attribute this to our focus on MTSS by having a strong team of individuals to implement interventions and monitor the data regularly. Our team did a great job of identifying those students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

EWS data indicates a need to focus on our students with disabilities and a continued focus on the lowest 25%. If we stretch our students with disabilities to grade-level standards exposing them to rigorous curriculum then our subgroups and school grade will increase proficiency.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

- 1. Identifying and providing grade-level standard instruction to all students (specifically SWDs and lowest 25%) while knowing our students by name and need.
- 2. Inclusion
- 3. CWTs. Bi-monthly CWT walks monitoring academics and monthly feedback for behavior.
- 4. Admin participation in PLCs weekly.
- 5. Data chats monthly for MTSS/quarterly data chats with progress monitoring data/WIG Wednesday with students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|--|---|
| Title | ELA/Math Lowest Quartile/Subgroups (SWD, Black, Multiracial) Students |
| Rationale | As data indicates, HPE is working to identify students by name and need in order to increase school grade categories for lowest quartile and also address the needs of the following subgroups: SWD, Black, Multiracial. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Hiland Park Elementary will increase math lowest quartile from 46 to 62 (16 percentage points) and maintain ELA lowest quartile gains at 62%. Subgroups (SWD, Black, Multiracial) identified within that category will also increase. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Ilea Faircloth (faircim@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence- based Strategy | Students will continue to track their own goals using our WIGs (Wildly Important Goals) at the school, grade, and student levels. Teachers will keep track all students using the MTSS Universal Spreadsheet where students will be discussed regularly in PLC meetings and monthly MTSS Leadership meetings. Additionally, teachers will complete Data Chat forms to drive trimester data chats. |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy | John Hattie identified self-reported grades had an effect of 1.33 and feedback had an effect size of .70. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | WIGs (School, grade, student) ELA and Math Teacher tracking students using MTSS Universal Spreadsheet Data Chats each tri-mester after MAP administration with admin and students. |

5.

Person Responsible

Ilea Faircloth (faircim@bay.k12.fl.us)

| #2 | |
|--|---|
| Title | Rigorous Instruction (PLCs, Intervention, Feedback, Support)- Learning gains for all |
| Rationale | As data indicates, HPE is a C with many components being under the desired 62% of points. We will focus on rigorous instruction to increase every category relating to proficiency and learning gains. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Hiland Park Elementary will increase all components to at least 62% of points possible in order to become an A school. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | llea Faircloth (faircim@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | PLCs will focus on planning and preparation of Eureka and EL curriculum while administration focuses on providing regular feedback and support through strategic coaching and CWTs. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | John Hattie identified feedback had an effect size of .70, teacher clarity .75, formative evaluation .45, and collective teacher efficacy at 1.57. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | PLCs meeting regularly for planning and preparation of Eureka/EL curriculum (Admin joining weekly on Thursday) Strategic intervention for ELA and Math CWT Feedback regularly by admin Support of strategic coaching when identified Consistent support of students with disabilities within the inclusive classroom setting. |
| Person Responsible | Ilea Faircloth (faircim@bay.k12.fl.us) |

| #3 | |
|--|---|
| | |
| Title | Behavior (Leader in Me/House System/PBIS Revitalization) |
| Rationale | As data indicates, the past 3 years Hiland Park has had 1019 referrals (2016), 1026 (2017), and 426 (2019). |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Hiland Park Elementary will continue to decrease the number of discipline referrals in order to maintain instructional momentum. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Lora Frowert (frowelr@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Leader in Me Core Behavior Program, implementation of Ron Clark House System, and discussing behavior data regularly. |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy | Marzano identified rules and procedures had an effect size of .76, disciplinary interventions had an effect size of .91, and teacher-student relationships had an effect of .87. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Behavior Interventionist to monitor and assist with behavior interventions Leader in Me as core program House System and celebrations Use of morning meeting to support Leader in Me Use of Social Worker to support students within the classroom setting and small group where appropriate. Integration of "Proactive Place" in every classroom (Calm Down Bucket) Implementation of EL program which addresses core values. Monthly meeting of Threat Assessment Team and MTSS Leadership to discuss students with behavioral concerns. |
| Person Responsible | Lora Frowert (frowelr@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

See above.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 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.

See the attached Title I Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

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.

Services provided by social workers, school counselors, mental health counselors, Telehealth counselors, behavior interventionists, PROMISE paras, and mentors; and the implementation of check-in/out programs, character education programs, and PBIS.

Additionally, Hiland Park is a Leader in Me LightHouse school in conjunction with the house system. We strive to teach our students the 7Habits of Highly Effective People.

- 1 Be proactive.
- 2 Begin with the end in mind.
- 3 Put first things first.
- 4 Think win-win.
- 5 Seek first to understand, then to be understood.
- 6 Synergize!
- 7 Sharpen the Saw
- 8- Find your voice

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 with preschool teachers to ensure a smooth transition into kindergarten. Onsite preschool teachers are invited to 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. Additionally, Hiland Park participated in "Kinder Academy" to invite our students to come to school for basic assessments for us to see what they know. We provided clothing and school supplies upon request to meet the needs of our students and assist with the transition. 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 the 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.

Bay District Schools ensures principals, school counselors, and social workers are made aware of available resources from various funding sources during district provided meetings throughout the school year. The needs of students and their families identified during parent-teacher conferences, MTSS meetings, IEP meetings, social worker visits, etc. are addressed by the school counselor and/or social worker by coordinating services and programs provided by federal, state, and local funds within the school system and the community. Students in MTSS tiers II and III are monitored frequently to determine the impact of services and adjustments are made accordingly.

Hiland Park strives to extend learning beyond the classroom through educational field trips and extra

curricular activities.

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. We meet weekly with our grade level PLCs to discuss curriculum needs. Monthly, we meet to discuss with our teachers using the Universal Spreadsheet which houses data academic and behavior data for each student and where every student is monitored for EWS indicators.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA/Math Lowest Quartile/Subgroups (SWD, Black, Multiracial) Students | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Rigorous Instruction (PLCs, Intervention, Feedback, Support)- Learning gains for all | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Behavior (Leader in Me/House System/PBIS Revitalization) | \$0.00 |
| | | Total: | \$0.00 |