

Bay District Schools

Cedar Grove 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Cedar Grove Elementary School

2826 E 15TH ST, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	100%
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: D (38%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: F (31%) 2014-15: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

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>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	D	C	F

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, at Cedar Grove along with the community, will engage, enrich, and educate every child every day in every way.

School Wide Pledge:

We are:

Collaborative, Confident,

Hardworking, Helpful,

Ambitious, Accountable

Motivated, Mindful,

Positive, Peaceful,

Successful Students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

The vision at Cedar Grove Elementary School is to become unified and focused on motivating our students for a rapidly changing world. We will instill in them critical thinking skills and respect for core values: honesty, loyalty, perseverance and compassion. In doing this, our students will become productive citizens and contribute to our school, our community and our country.

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
Wojnowski, Sheila	Principal	
Echols, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Ammons, Yvonne	Teacher, K-12	
Baxley, Adrian	Teacher, K-12	
Newsome, Tina	Other	Assists with counselor responsibilities, attendance, etc.
Bunch, Peggy	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Assist the principal in interviewing and evaluating instructional and non-instructional staff. -Supervise instructional and non-instructional staff. -Help create school-wide goals including those related to student learning and student behavior. -Manage student behavioral issues including those in the cafeteria along with those referred by teachers and bus drivers. -Supervise or arrange for supervision of student activities both during and after school hours including school assemblies, athletic activities, and music and drama productions. -Share responsibility for setting and meeting the school's budget. -Set up the academic schedule for teachers and students. -Keep track of all activities on the school calendar.
Bylsma, Cody	Teacher, K-12	
Sanders, Susan	Teacher, ESE	
English, Carissa	Teacher, K-12	
Ferns, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	90	105	116	85	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	28	39	34	34	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	2	17	14	16	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	2	13	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	32	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	14	7	23	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	13	7	2	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/3/2019

Prior Year - 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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	12	5	4	10	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

Prior Year - 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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	12	5	4	10	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	33%	55%	57%	40%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	59%	58%	52%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	57%	53%	59%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	25%	56%	63%	40%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	41%	54%	62%	58%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	42%	51%	43%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	53%	53%	23%	44%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	96 (0)	90 (0)	105 (0)	116 (0)	85 (0)	95 (0)	587 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	28 (32)	39 (30)	34 (18)	34 (19)	23 (20)	29 (13)	187 (132)
One or more suspensions	2 (18)	17 (10)	14 (11)	16 (18)	14 (17)	25 (9)	88 (83)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (29)	4 (23)	2 (25)	13 (53)	2 (49)	6 (27)	27 (206)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	16 (52)	32 (43)	55 (24)	103 (119)

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	27%	61%	-34%	58%	-31%
	2018	28%	57%	-29%	57%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	28%	58%	-30%	58%	-30%
	2018	15%	51%	-36%	56%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	32%	56%	-24%	56%	-24%
	2018	32%	50%	-18%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	25%	62%	-37%	62%	-37%
	2018	25%	63%	-38%	62%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	24%	59%	-35%	64%	-40%
	2018	31%	59%	-28%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	20%	54%	-34%	60%	-40%
	2018	26%	57%	-31%	61%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	23%	54%	-31%	53%	-30%
	2018	34%	54%	-20%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	34	36	29	36	45	50				

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
BLK	27	61	85	19	45	73	13				
HSP	20			36							
MUL	50			36							
WHT	39	54		27	28	36	47				
FRL	32	58	69	23	41	58	34				
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				

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	46
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	320
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	28
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	43
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	39
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Our students have consistently scored lower in math than in ELA across grade levels. Even with this, we were still at only 32% proficiency for ELA 5th grade, 28% for 4th grade and 27% for 3rd. In math, we maintained the same proficiency score of 25% in 3rd grade, dropped 7% proficiency in 4th grade and dropped 6% in 5th grade. Our students struggle with place value and developing automaticity in their basic facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication and division). They also have difficulty with solving real world problems using conceptual knowledge of basic operations.

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

Our math proficiency scores showed the greatest decline by dropping 13% points across three grade levels. Teachers are still not fully understanding how to implement Eureka Math and our students struggle with understanding the concepts. Time to fully implement the program continues to be a barrier as well. We had a lot of teacher absences in grades 3-5, which caused students to have less math instruction. We have teachers assigned to new grade levels and new teachers just coming on board. Their lack of knowledge in how to instruct in the curriculum has contributed to the decline.

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.

Our math scores show the greatest gap when compared with the state average. 3rd grade: 25% proficiency for Cedar Grove and 62% is the state average. 4th grade: 24% for Cedar Grove and 59% proficiency is the state average. In 5th grade 20% of our students were proficient; the state average was 54%.

As stated above we had numerous absences (majority storm related with students and teachers), experienced and new teachers not familiar with how to teach the curriculum with fidelity. Finally, students were not able to comprehend the instruction, nor were they able to generalize what they saw in instruction to a different format shown on statewide assessments.

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

Seventy percent of our lowest quartile in ELA made learning gains. We focused on writing daily, reading complex text and asking higher order questions. We used Connect to Comprehension for our Tier III students, which is a program we have used for several years. The trend has been steadily increasing with this subgroup (lowest 25%tile) over the past two years.

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

Attendance is an issue, many of our students are still working through hurricane issues and it effects their attendance. Our students who scored a level one in either or both ELA and Math on state assessments are another concern. 103 out of 296 students scored a level one or both state tests. Our students with disabilities, Hispanic students, and white students did not reach the 41% threshold for proficiency according to ESSA.

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

1. Students scoring Level 1 on either ELA and Math state assessments
2. Math scores dropping in the last two years
3. ELA and math scores approximately 40% points lower than the state average
4. Attendance issues
5. Our Hispanic students at 28% of the federal index, scoring below all subgroups for consecutive years

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA /Math/Science
Rationale	Students need reading strategies and skills to improve proficiency. Currently our students are scoring at 33% and lower in proficiency across grade levels.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our students were at 33% proficiency in ELA on their FSA assessment, at 59% of students making learning gains overall and our lowest quartile were at 70% of them meeting their learning gains. We plan to focus on increasing all of our students overall proficiency in ELA from a school wide percentage of 33% to 41%, which is a gain of eight percentage points. We will focus on our subgroups who were unable to reach the 41% federal index. These subgroups include: students with disabilities who we will target to improve their overall performance for 36% to 41%. Our next subgroup is our white population, our goal will be that they gain the 2% points needed to reach the federal threshold of 41%. Finally, our aim for our Hispanic students, will be to move them from 28% to the 41% of the federal index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of the research based content literacy module block in the EL Education Curriculum. Teachers will teach the Module Block as well as the Foundation Skills (k-2)and the ALL Block (3-5). The Module Block will address grade level standards based instruction while the Foundations and ALL Block will assist students to fill gaps in their knowledge. The EL Education Curriculum contains the following components: It is research-based It is standards-based Enlists high interest grade level texts Promotes close reading Includes a writing component that builds stamina and endurance https://eleducation.org/impact/curriculum/research-studies (rationale from EL Education website)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
	1. Action: Professional Development. Activity: a. Summer training on EL Education implementation b. Teacher ongoing reivew of curriculum during PLCs. c. TNTP support in implementing EL Education d.. ELA/Math/Science liaison meetings Monitoring : Sign in sheets, Lesson plan/PLC minutes template
Description	2. Action: Ongoing District Coaching Activity: a. Literacy Coach's weekly visits to classrooms to the provide individual and grade level support in implementing the Module, Foundations and ALL Block. b. The district ELA coach monthly visits to provide feedback on pacing and teaching the program with fidelity. c. The district math coach working with grade levels to implement Eureka Math with fidelity to assist with struggling subgroups.

Monitoring:

Literacy Coach activity review, ELA/math Coaches feedback information, MTSS monthly academic meetings/MTSS spreadsheet

3. Action: PLC participation

Activity:

PLC weekly work in creating lesson plans for all subject areas

Monitoring:

Review of lesson plans weekly (see admin comments)

Administration support during PLCs (see lesson plan/PLC minutes template)

4. Action: Peer Coaching

Activity:

a. PLC presentation of daily lessons by each teacher

b. Teacher visits to colleague's classrooms to learn strategies

Monitoring:

Lesson plan/PLC minutes template

5. Action: Differentiated instruction to meet individual student needs

Activity:

Administration visits to observe instruction

Monitoring:

Classroom Walk Through Forms (CWT), Lesson plan link to differentiated groups (MTSS tier groups)

6. Action: Monitor Student growth

Activity:

a. Teachers/Administration monitor lowest quartile instruction

b. Provide small group instruction

c. ESOL para to support ELL students

d. ESE Resource teachers supporting classrooms

Monitoring:

Lesson plan/PLC minutes template, student performance on common assessments-see MTSS spread sheet -bimonthly, review student growth on MAP winter and spring sessions

7. Action: Instructional Paras

Activity:

a. Paras support small group instruction in all areas of instruction

Monitoring:

Para schedules

8. Action: Extra teachers to support Tier II and Tier III students

Activity:

a. Smaller class sizes

b. Support Tier II and III students with the MTSS process

Monitoring:

Class lists, Learning Academy schedules, Enrich progress monitoring

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

#2	
Title	Behavior (Mental Health)
Rationale	<p>Students deserve a safe and engaging environment in which to learn. We evaluated our current and found the following trends: as a result of rezoning we are merging students from five prior schools. Students attempt to gain leadership among their peers which results in discipline issues. Students are still recovering from Hurricane Michael, we have students who are living in substandard circumstances which affects their mental health. Also some of our kinder through 2nd grade students do not have the skills to succeed socially. Some of our kinder students have never been in a learning environment, so they struggle with personal space, being attentive during instruction, etc.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Our goal is to reduce the number of suspensions by 10% across grade levels. Our present data shows that kinder had 2 suspensions, so a 10% reduction would result in having 1.8 or 2 suspensions. For 1st grade we had 17 suspensions, 10% of 17 is 1.7 so that would mean that to meet the goal 15 suspension. Second and fourth grade had 14 suspensions. We will reduce their suspensions by 1.4, that would have their suspensions at 13. Third grade students had 16 suspension last year; we hope to reduce that number to 14. Finally, 5th grade will have 22 suspensions or less if we can reduce their 25 suspensions from last year by 10%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Peggy Bunch (bunchpd@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Implement Classroom management (CHAMPS), Restorative Practices, and Core Essentials campus wide. CHAMPS uses a structured approach to define what students will be doing for each activity using the CHAMPS acronym to define what the conversation level, teacher help provided, activity, movement allowed and what participation is required for students to reach success. Restorative Practices (Circle) and Core Essentials are character education programs that build class community and empathetic practices as well as provide classroom contracts to help students manage and monitor their behavior. We are piloting us mindfulness to help students regulate their breathing through breathing, movements and reflection time. Mental Health Team (HOPE Team, HOPE/SWAT) and Behavioral paras in classrooms and around campus to assist students when they need individual and small group counsel in monitoring and correcting their behavior.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>These resources and strategies will offer support for both students and teachers to form a partnership for learning. Guidance from experienced and knowledgeable mental health professionals helps to provide students and teachers with necessary resources while keeping them in engaged and on track for learning in the classroom.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<p>1.Action: CHAMPS professional development and implementation Activity: a. Pre-inservice instruction on CHAMPS (Administration and peer teachers, faculty meeting/PLC day refresher on CHAMPS) b. Teachers using CHAMPS throughout their instructional day Monitoring: Sign in sheets, CWT, Agendas (Teachers, Administration), Lesson plan/PLC minutes template</p>

2. Action: Restorative Practices (Circle) and Core Essentials professional development and implementation

Activity:

a. Training for all staff with Rufus Lott III at National Professional Resources, Inc. (Three times a year), PLC

review of Core Essentials for daily instruction

b. Teacher using Circle and Core Essentials daily to build tier I character education skills in students

Monitoring:

Sign in sheets, CWT, email recap of through the year training of Restorative Practices (Teachers, Administration), Lesson plan/PLC minutes template

3.Action: Review of early warning system monthly

Activity:

a. Review EWS information during MTSS, Threat Assessment monthly meetings, and behavior meetings

b. Develop strategies for assisting struggling students identified by the EWS data (Intervention Teachers)

Monitoring:

Agendas of meetings, Social Emotional Learning spreadsheet

4. Action: Mental Health Supports

Activity:

a. Hope Team supports of students through social groups and individual counselling

b. Behavior/ISS/Promise Paras and Intervention Teacher support students with strategies to gain skill in

interacting in socially .

Monitoring:

Social Emotional Learning spreadsheet, Promise Para spreadsheet

5. Action: Yoga ED implementation

Activity:

a. District and Yoga ED staff provide training on utilizing Yoga ED (mindfulness in the classroom)

b. Weekly visits by district staff working with our kinder and 3rd grade classrooms on implementation of the

program

Monitoring:

Sign in sheets, Notes/emails from district staff on implementation,

Person Responsible Karen Cajote (cajotkc@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).

Our strategies for improving ELA/math/science proficiency and behaviors will help to improve proficiency across all sub-groups in ELA, Math, and Science.

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, 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.

Reference our PFEP attached below

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.

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

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 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 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.

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

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA /Math/Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Behavior (Mental Health)	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00