

Bay District Schools

# Lucille Moore Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>23</b> |

# Lucille Moore Elementary School

1900 MICHIGAN AVE, Panama City, FL 32405

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Christina Bordelon**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: D (36%)<br>2016-17: D (34%)<br>2015-16: D (36%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  | N/A  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  | N/A  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

## 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>23</b> |

# Lucille Moore Elementary School

1900 MICHIGAN AVE, Panama City, FL 32405

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 70%  |

## School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       | C       | D       | D       |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

## 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 will prepare all students for college and life by providing a challenging curriculum that is relevant to our students lives and their future in a safe, supportive, and nurturing environment.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Empowering students to make a positive difference.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

| Name                | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Bordelon, Christina | Assistant Principal | Christina Bordelon- Administrative Assistant: Mrs. Bordelon supports Mrs. Weatherly in her administrative role. She aides in the evaluation of teacher and paraprofessional performance, data analysis, etc. She helps to provide teachers with what resources they need to implement effective instruction in the classroom. She meets regularly with teachers to discuss student data and teacher performance data. She works with the Behavior Interventionist and Social Worker to implement effective discipline procedures and strategies with at-risk students.  |
| Frigon, Tracy       | Instructional Media | Tracy Frigon- Instructional Media and Technology: Tracy participates in all leadership meetings. She provides much needed support and resources to all teachers and staff in the area of media and technology. She provides training to teachers in various areas related to technology and student achievement.  |
| Davis, Kevin        | Other               | Kevin Davis- Title I Coordinator: Kevin oversees activities, mandates, budget, requirements, etc connected to Title I. He provides teachers and staff with the resources, tools and information they need to carry out effective instruction. He works with Guidance and Instructional district personnel in providing resources/strategies to students in special programs such as MTSS, Behavior MTSS, students in crisis, low attendance, etc. He also oversees the Parent Involvement Plan and implementation of the plan and activities at Lucille Moore Elementary.   |
| Weatherly, Keri     | Principal           | Keri Weatherly- Principal: Oversees and evaluates all functions of the school. Mrs. Weatherly evaluates teacher and paraprofessional performance through the teacher appraisal system, classroom walk-throughs, data chats, assessment data, etc. She sits on various committees to give guidance and input (ie MTSS). She leads and guides the school leadership team and the implementation of effective PLCs. She makes sure that teachers have the resources they need to implement curriculum, assessment and instruction effectively. She is the main connection between district initiatives and implementation of those initiatives at Lucille Moore Elementary School. |
| Gaddy, Melissa      | Teacher, K-12       | Teachers actively participate on the School Leadership Team. They give much needed input and shared decision-making from a classroom teacher's perspective. They also provide leadership to the PLCs and resources to all teachers throughout the school.   |
| Wielenga, Crystal   | Teacher, K-12       | Teachers actively participate on the School Leadership Team. They give much needed input and shared decision-making from a classroom teacher's perspective. They also provide leadership to the PLCs and resources to all teachers throughout the school.   |
| Pickrell, Kathy     | Teacher, K-12       | Teachers actively participate on the School Leadership Team. They give much needed input and shared decision-making from a classroom teacher's  |



| Name                 | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|----------------------|---------------------|--|
|                      |                     | perspective. They also provide leadership to the PLCs and resources to all teachers throughout the school.   |
| Miller, Jennifer     | Instructional Coach | Jennifer Miller - Literacy Coach: Provides valuable assistance in ELA to include delivering necessary PD, modeling , coaching, and working with teachers in their PLC's with lesson preparation.   |
| Rushing, Ronada      | Assistant Principal | Supports Mrs. Weatherly in her administrative role. She aides in the evaluation of teacher and paraprofessional performance, data analysis, etc. She helps to provide teachers with what resources they need to implement effective instruction in the classroom. She meets regularly with teachers to discuss student data and teacher performance data. She works with the Behavior Interventionist and Social Worker to implement effective discipline procedures and strategies with at-risk students. |
| Carl, Diane          | School Counselor    | Guidance Counselor actively participate on the School Leadership Team. They give much needed input and shared decision-making from a classroom guidance counselor's perspective. They also provide leadership to the PLCs and resources to all teachers and students throughout the school   |
| Ashley, Jessica      | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Gibson, Gloria       | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Harrington, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12       | Intervention teacher   |
| Price, Kellie        | Teacher, K-12       | First Grade grade chair  |
| Siegal, Miriam       | Teacher, K-12       | Fourth grade grade chair   |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Christina Bordelon

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

29

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: D (36%)<br>2016-17: D (34%)<br>2015-16: D (36%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  | N/A  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  | N/A  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

**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               | 68          | 73 | 68 | 62 | 67 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 402   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 8           | 17 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 63    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 7  | 6  | 12 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 2  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |

**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           | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/27/2020

**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 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 77          | 79 | 71 | 68 | 63 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 441   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 15          | 14 | 12 | 10 | 6  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 67    |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 1  | 6  | 3  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 17 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49    |

**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 | 1           | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |

**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 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

### 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 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 77          | 79 | 71 | 68 | 63 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 441   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 15          | 14 | 12 | 10 | 6  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 67    |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 1  | 6  | 3  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 17 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49    |

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 | 1           | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |

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 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

## 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             | 38%    | 55%      | 57%   | 27%    | 49%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 56%    | 59%      | 58%   | 42%    | 54%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 65%    | 57%      | 53%   | 54%    | 55%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 41%    | 56%      | 63%   | 20%    | 52%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 52%    | 54%      | 62%   | 36%    | 55%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 56%    | 42%      | 51%   | 41%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 37%    | 53%      | 53%   | 17%    | 44%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | K                                 | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |       |
|           | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

#### Grade Level Data

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

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 39%    | 61%      | -22%                       | 58%   | -19%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 21%    | 57%      | -36%                       | 57%   | -36%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 18%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 44%    | 58%      | -14%                       | 58%   | -14%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 23%    | 51%      | -28%                       | 56%   | -33%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 21%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 23%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 30%    | 56%      | -26%                       | 56%   | -26%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 25%    | 50%      | -25%                       | 55%   | -30%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 48%    | 62%      | -14%                       | 62%   | -14%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 37%    | 63%      | -26%                       | 62%   | -25%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 46%    | 59%      | -13%                       | 64%   | -18%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 16%    | 59%      | -43%                       | 62%   | -46%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 30%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 23%    | 54%      | -31%                       | 60%   | -37%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 14%    | 57%      | -43%                       | 61%   | -47%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2019 | 42%    | 54%      | -12%                       | 53%   | -11%                    |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 23%    | 54%      | -31%                       | 55%   | -32%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 19%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 29       | 49     | 56          | 35        | 47      | 47           | 14       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 19       | 57     |             | 35        | 48      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 40       | 56     | 69          | 37        | 49      | 64           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 25       | 58     |             | 36        | 48      |              | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 33       |        |             | 55        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 48       | 59     |             | 43        | 63      |              | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 37       | 57     | 61          | 42        | 54      | 58           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 19       | 24     | 25          | 25        | 33      | 27           | 7        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 23       | 56     | 53          | 26        | 54      |              | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 20       | 33     |             | 19        | 21      |              | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 32       | 50     | 50          | 37        | 55      | 60           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 25       | 36     |             | 27        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 28       | 27     |             | 37        | 41      |              | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 26       | 38     | 46          | 28        | 41      | 43           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 17       | 38     | 39          | 9         | 32      | 40           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 15       | 38     |             | 15        | 32      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 17       | 40     | 36          | 8         | 32      |              | 11       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 37       | 42     |             | 26        | 41      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 31       | 50     |             | 19        | 30      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 26       | 42     |             | 26        | 36      | 55           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 25       | 43     | 48          | 20        | 36      | 40           | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 52   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 73   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 418  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 40   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 46   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| 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%         | 0    |
| 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%                   | 0    |
| Black/African American Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                 | 50   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  | 0    |
| Hispanic Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students   | 45   |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO   |

| Hispanic Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 44  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| 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%           | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 51  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 53  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## 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.**

The school-wide data component that performed the lowest is science, 37%. This was also the lowest performing area from the year before, although there was an increase from the 2018 school year to the 2019 school year of 13%.

The contributing factor would be the current reading level of our students. Our students struggle to successfully read and comprehend the science content and assessment.

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

There was not school-wide data component with the greatest decline from the 2018 school year to the 2019 school year. There was an increase in every area.

The plan and strategies that were implemented last year assisted in ensuring that we were moving in the right direction.



**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.**

The school-wide data component with the biggest gap when compared to the state average is Math Achievement, with a difference of 22%.

Although this is the greatest gap when comparing our school to the state, we closed the gap by 10% when compared to the gap that existed in the 2018 school year. The lack of certain skills the students must have to be successful in their current grade level is evident and hinders the academic success of demonstrating proficiency.

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

The school-wide component that showed the most improvement is the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile, with an increase of 22%.

Focusing on the academic needs of the students has allowed us to provide specific instruction that assisted in closing the gap with our lowest 25%.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

The sub group area not meeting the target of 41%, according to the ESSA Federal index, is Students with Disabilities currently at 40%. This is our area of concern.

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency
4. Students with Disabilities
5. Behavior

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>                     | <p>Lucille Moore will increase student proficiency in science, reading, and math, by using appropriate data to identify specific needs in order to plan and provide accelerated intervention, instruction, and enrichment.</p> <p>Focusing on accelerated intervention, instruction and enrichment based on students' needs will increase the number of students who achieve learning gains. Increasing the students making learning gains will therefore increase our number of student that will be proficient in ELA, math, and science.</p>  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>  | <p>The number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in ELA will increase from 65% to 70%.</p> <p>The number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gain in math will increase from 56% to 60%.</p> <p>The number of student making learning gains overall in ELA will increase from 56% to 60%.</p> <p>The number of students making learning gains overall in math will increase from 52% to 60%.</p> <p>With these learning gain projected we will increase proficiency in the are of ELA from 38% to 50% and in area of math from 41% to 50%.</p> <p>Increase the ESSA number of ESE students from 40% to 43%</p> <p>This intended outcome will allow the overall growth to increase from 49% to 54% (5%), raising our school grade from a C to a B!</p>   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>                   | Keri Weatherly (weathka@bay.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                                     | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Through the utilization of effective grade level PLCS, teachers and instructional coaches will collaborate to plan and prepare for effective instruction and intervention based of students' needs.</li> <li>2. Collaboration and Professional Development with TNTP provides teachers the support and guidance needs to understand student data and base instruction and intervention on the needs of the students.</li> <li>3. Simplified MTSS/RTI at Work will be implemented, allowing us to strengthen and support the school's academic program through strategic focus.</li> <li>4. Data Chat meetings (to include MTSS Interventionist- School and District Level, School of Hope Team Members) and administration discuss the needs of the students have develop a plan to address the needs.</li> <li>5. Dedicated Intervention/Enrichment Time</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                       | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher meet at least once as week to prepare and plan for standards based instruction. They will review student data and discuss the implementation of effective instruction and invention strategies based on the needs of students as demonstrated on the data shared.</li> <li>2. The collaboration with TNTP will ensure that instruction meets the intended rigor of the standards and intervention is based on the academic needs of the students.</li> <li>3. Monthly Data chat meetings with all teachers in grade level PLCs, instructional coaches, support team members (to include MTSS Interventionist- School and District Level, School of Hope Team Members) and administration will discuss the needs of the students and develop a plan to address the needs.</li> <li>4. Intervention Fidelity, Fluidity, Accountability, Monitoring. Within the master schedule, students have a specific Math as well AS ELA time for providing intervention and enrichment to all students at Lucille Moore.</li> </ol> |

## Action Steps to Implement

Through the utilization of effective grade level PLCS, teachers and instructional coaches will collaborate to plan and prepare for effective instruction and intervention based on students' needs. Teacher will meet at least once a week to prepare and plan for standards based instruction. Collaboration will continue as they review student data and discuss the implementation of effective instruction and intervention strategies based on the needs of students as demonstrated on the data.

**Person Responsible** Keri Weatherly (weathka@bay.k12.fl.us)

Simplified MTSS/RTI at Work will be implemented, allowing us to strengthen and support the school's academic program through strategic focus. We will implement a universal spreadsheet to track data on students that need extra intervention based on current academic need identified in the classroom assessments and teacher formative assessments. The universal spreadsheet will assist us monthly at MTSS

Leadership Team meeting where all teachers in grade level PLCs, instructional coaches, support team members (to include MTSS Interventionist- School and District Level, School of Hope Team Members) and administration discuss the needs of the students have develop a plan to address the needs. Having the sheet available to teachers and staff allows them to update information in real time for us to problem solve the MTSS process for academics as well as behavior.

**Person Responsible** Keri Weatherly (weathka@bay.k12.fl.us)

Dedicated Intervention/Enrichment Time

Intervention Fidelity, Fluidity, Accountability, Monitoring. In addition to the use of the Universal Spreadsheet above, each teacher will keep an SRA data notebook on students in SRA which includes those below grade level. Within the master schedule, students have a specific Math as well as ELA time specifically for providing intervention and enrichment to all students at Lucille Moore.

1. Effective PLCs, administration attendance and
2. Collaboration and Professional Development with TNTP
3. Simplified MTSS/RTI
4. Data Meetings
5. Dedicated Intervention and Enrichment time, ensuring ESE students, students below grade level, lowest 25%, and students above grade levels academic needs are met.

**Person Responsible** Keri Weatherly (weathka@bay.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring for effectiveness:

a) Data collected and reviewed will be MAP, FSA, Classroom Walk-through data, Common Assessments, MTSS data, and SRA data

b) When and how often data will be collected and reviewed:

MAP (3 Times per year)

Classroom walk-through data will be reviewed as it occurs.

Common Assessment data will be reviewed weekly during the PLC and monthly

c) We plan to monitor effectiveness through teacher and student data chat meetings after the MAP administration and through monthly MTSS meetings. We will have student conferences so students will know their current academic standings and what is needed to make growth and the areas that the most growth is needed. We will make changes as needed based on data and ensure the intervention and acceleration utilized is effective based on the students' academic performance. If academic progress is not occurring plans will modify as needed.

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Keri Weatherly (weathka@bay.k12.fl.us) |
|---------------------------|--|

## #2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

**Area of Focus** Lucille Moore Elementary will continue to perfect the 15 minute implementation of character education daily and the positive incentives to continue the decrease in the number of discipline referrals by 5%.

**Description and Rationale:** Implementing character education daily will teach behavior expectations and how to respond to tough situations.

**Measurable Outcome:** Effective instruction in character education will let to a decrease of discipline by 5%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Keri Weatherly (weathka@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Core Essentials is the school-wide character development curriculum.
2. Positive behavior will be celebrated monthly with the Phenomenal Patriot pep rally.
3. Class DOJO is the school-wide positive behavior management system.
4. Provide wrap around services for Patriots to keep them in the classroom in order to regain instructional time.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Through the implementation of these strategies in the 2018-2019 school year, we were able to decrease our disciplinary incidents by 48%. Through the continuation and perfection of these strategies we will be able to continue the trend.

### Action Steps to Implement

Core Essentials is the school-wide character development curriculum. This curriculum will define and teach students the expected behavior for school. Addition to the Core Essentials curriculum, school-wide transition and behavior expectations and will be retaught and posted in classrooms, hallways, cafeteria, and common areas and coincide with expectations.

Positive behavior will be celebrated Monthly with the Phenomenal Patriot recognition. Each class will nominate the student that best exemplifies the core behavior trait of the month. Also, we will celebrate with weekly drawing that highlights students making smart decisions.

Class DOJO is the school-wide positive behavior management system. Each class will utilize classroom DOJO and grade levels will base their positive points around the school-wide expectations. Each grade level, in their PLC's, comes up with ways students can exchange their DOJO points for positive rewards.

**Person Responsible** Keri Weatherly (weathka@bay.k12.fl.us)

Utilize the School of Hope grant to build wrap around services for Patriots to keep them in the classroom for instructional time. If a student is in crisis and the classroom teacher or paraprofessional cannot remain proactive in redirecting behavior and restoring the student's behavior then the next layer of support will be notified through the office. If the student is in crisis and the team must be reactive, then an available School of Hope (Triad) team member will assist. Students will be tracked using the Universal Spreadsheet in order to track progress and ensure trend for DRs decrease to keep instructional momentum. The MTSS-B team will meet monthly to Implement wraparound services to address barriers preventing students from being engaged learners and strategies for demonstrating positive traits. School of Hope team members and PROMISE para will see students who have been identified as needing social/emotional supports.

**Person Responsible** Keri Weatherly (weathka@bay.k12.fl.us)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**According to the Needs assessment analysis, Lucille Moore Elementary improved in all areas of focus. The leadership team will continue their participation to move forward with the action steps listed within our plan for improvement areas of focus. We will accomplish this with the leadership team by meeting quarterly to ensure the action steps are addressing the areas of focus and decisions and direction is based on data and needs of students. During these quarterly meetings, progress of our subgroups will be monitored with a focus on students with disabilities, the only subgroup not meeting the current target of 41%**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Lucille Moore Elementary strives to provide a culture of acceptance and infinite possibility. Not only to we make every effort to meet the academic success of our students, we do our best to ensure students and families have the tools and necessities to address their basic needs.

We are able to accomplish a positive school culture and environment by consulting with various stakeholders. Working in partnership with educational institutions, businesses, local governments, school board members, volunteers, mentors, and social services we are able to offer our teachers, students and families additional resources that they need to be successful!

- Inviting school board members to participate in back to school events opens the door for those members to understand the dynamics of the school therefore lending itself to make better informed decisions.
- Collaboration with Panama City City Council on a partnership with students and the city to educate students on city government and expose students to live sessions of the government in action.
- Elevate Bay mentors invest, support, and partner with several students and classrooms to encourage and motivate students to maximize their potential.
- Various Church partnerships- campus beautification, donations of food, clothes and shoe.
- Gulf Coast College partnership to expose students to different forms of music and educate elementary students with music opportunities in college.
- FSU partnership math event to assist in creating a culture where students love math.
- Oceaneering partnership to educate and expose students to different career fields and job opportunities in Panama City.
- Inviting Social Services to school events allows them to offers additional student and family educational opportunities and supplemental resources for families.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

## Part V: Budget

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

|        |        |   |        |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline       | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |   | \$0.00 |