

Bay District Schools

Deer Point 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 | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Deer Point Elementary School

4800 HIGHWAY 2321, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Reeder

Start Date for this Principal: 9/12/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 57% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (49%) 2014-15: B (60%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| 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. 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 | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Deer Point Elementary School

4800 HIGHWAY 2321, Panama City, FL 32404

[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;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">68%</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;">16%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
| Grade | C | C | C | C |

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 and staff through engaging, rigorous, 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 | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Reeder, Rebecca | Principal | |
| Knight, Jillian | School Counselor | |
| Petty, Michael | Assistant Principal | |
| Hudson, Crystal | Instructional Coach | |
| Jones, Wendy | Teacher, ESE | |
| Roberts, Amy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Webb, Robyn | Teacher, ESE | |

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 | 89 | 106 | 81 | 102 | 91 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 571 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 9 | 13 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

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 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/12/2019

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 | 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 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 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

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 | 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 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 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

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 | 56% | 55% | 57% | 56% | 49% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 61% | 59% | 58% | 48% | 54% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 57% | 53% | 46% | 55% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 53% | 56% | 63% | 54% | 52% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 45% | 54% | 62% | 48% | 55% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 24% | 42% | 51% | 42% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 61% | 53% | 53% | 60% | 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 | 89 (0) | 106 (0) | 81 (0) | 102 (0) | 91 (0) | 102 (0) | 571 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 (37) | 9 (25) | 13 (30) | 14 (37) | 9 (31) | 5 (27) | 67 (187) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (5) | 2 (2) | 0 (2) | 3 (1) | 3 (1) | 1 (5) | 9 (16) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 3 (1) | 0 (2) | 2 (5) | 6 (9) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 5 (26) | 17 (26) | 37 (46) | 59 (98) |

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 | 57% | 61% | -4% | 58% | -1% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 57% | -6% | 57% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 50% | 58% | -8% | 58% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 51% | 11% | 56% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 60% | 56% | 4% | 56% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 50% | -5% | 55% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 59% | 62% | -3% | 62% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 63% | -7% | 62% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 44% | 59% | -15% | 64% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 59% | 4% | 62% | 1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -19% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 51% | 54% | -3% | 60% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 57% | -10% | 61% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 61% | 54% | 7% | 53% | 8% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 54% | -9% | 55% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| 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 | 26 | 39 | 35 | 24 | 34 | 16 | 50 | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 38 | | 48 | 31 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 46 | | | 38 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 63 | 47 | 54 | 45 | 28 | 55 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 58 | 42 | 46 | 40 | 18 | 60 | | | | |

| 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 | | | | |

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 | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 347 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 42 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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.

4th Grade math achievement 44%. This is a decline of 19% (cohort decline of 1%)
(trend - math achievement declined across the school, district, and state in all grade levels)
Possible contributing factors- less focus on Math last year as opposed to previous year.

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

4th grade math achievement decline of 19%
Subgroup MUL decline of 38% in math achievement

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.

Math Lowest 25th percentile
(Fewer students receiving math MTSS in comparison to ELA. There are fewer menu options to provide T3 MTSS in math. The length of math lessons may reduce the amount of time needed for small group differentiation.)

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

5th grade science +16%
Subgroups in science (SWD +30%, FRL +27%)

New Actions--refined instructional practice.

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

5th grade Level 1 on statewide assessment

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

1. Math Achievement (lowest 25th)
2. Math Achievement sub group (SWD, BL, MUL)
3. 4th grade math achievement
4. 4th grade ELA achievement
5. ELA Lowest 25th

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|---|---|
| #1 | |
| Title | ELA/Math Learning Gains of Lowest 25%, SWD, and BLK |
| Rationale | <p>Increase student learning gains, in the area of reading and math, by identifying specific student needs using appropriate data to plan and provide interventions and instruction. Deer Point Elementary is below the District and State averages in lowest quartile students scores on the FSA. Additionally, our SWD and BLK subgroups are not meeting Learning gains expectations. Increasing the students comprising the lowest 25% making learning gains, our school will increase our number of students that will be proficient in ELA and Math.</p> <p>In order to improve the performance of the lowest quartile students, Deer Point Elementary will:</p> |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase Math learning gains of the lowest quartile from 24% to 29%, which is below the state and district average for the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 SYs. 2. Increase ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile from 47% to 52%, which is below the state and district average for the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 SYs. 3. Increase Math and ELA learning gains of SWD from 34% to 39% and 39% to 44%, respectively. 4. Increase Math and ELA learning gains of BLK subgroup from 31% to 36% and 38% to 43%, respectively. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MTSS pull out support. 2. MAP testing/monitoring of lowest quartile students. 3. School-based instructional coach and district-level literacy coach. 4. EL Learning Curriculum. 5. ESE students are gaining access to the Eureka curriculum. 6. Increasing support in Inclusion Classes via ESE teachers. 7. Monitoring grade-level and instructional-level progress through IEPs and goals. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our lowest 25% of students is comprised of 13% students receiving MTSS, 47% ESE, and 4% BLK. By providing additional MTSS and ESE supports, and using our EL and Eureka curricula with fidelity, our SWD, Lowest 25%, and BLK subgroups are expected to receive more focused grade-level instruction and supports, and their learning gains will meet expectations. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional push-in inclusion ESE teachers to monitor and work with students 1:1 and in small group. 2. MTSS pull out support for those needing 1:1 and small group interventions. 3. MAP testing/monitoring of all students. 4. LiM Data chats with students, parents, within PLCs, to include goal setting. 5. Ongoing PD in EL Learning and Eureka curricula. 6. Full EL Learning and Eureka curricula implementation with fidelity -- monitored and implemented through PLCs, classroom walk-throughs, learning cycles, student data, and common assessments. |
| Person Responsible | Michael Petty (pettym@bay.k12.fl.us) |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| #2 | |
| Title | Behavior |
| Rationale | Deer Point Elementary will reduce disruptive behavior and build a positive school climate through continued school-wide implementation of character education and behavior improvement initiatives. |

| | |
|---|---|
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Deer Point staff wrote 200 disciplinary referrals during the 2018-2019 school year. Incidents of defiance/disrespect and inappropriate behavior (approximately 113 of these referrals, or over 57%) will decrease by 15%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | [no one identified] |
| Evidence-based Strategy | CAST Expectations, BDS 360, Merrell's Strong Kids, Leader in Me. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Leader in Me is an evidenced-based, comprehensive school improvement model that empowers students with the leadership and life skills they need to thrive. By teaching, modeling, and expecting students to live the 7 habits of the LiM model, intrinsic motivation to make appropriate choices and treat all with respect should result in our meeting discipline reduction targets. Evidence will include discipline data and LiM implementation data. |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Administration will work with teachers to establish classroom managed vs. office managed behaviors. Teachers will deliver daily lessons on character education from the LiM model. Teachers will use class Dojo to reinforce behavior that meets our CAST expectations, and the 7 Habits. Teachers will implement a classroom reward system to recognize students who are following the CAST expectations, and 7 Habits. Teachers will differentiate classroom vs. office managed behaviors in FOCUS. PROMISE room focuses on recovery using the BDS 360 program. Tier II students receive weekly social skill lessons using the Strong Kids curriculum. |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |

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).

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.

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

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA/Math Learning Gains of Lowest 25%, SWD, and BLK | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Behavior | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |