Waller Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Waller Elementary School

11332 E HIGHWAY 388, Youngstown, FL 32466

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gina Mcnally   Start Date for this Principal: 8/6/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	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.

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

Waller Elementary School

11332 E HIGHWAY 388, Youngstown, FL 32466

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

School Grades History

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

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.

Mission Statement:

Waller is an ACE school.We: Accomplish Goals, Create Excellence, Engage Learners

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision of Waller Elementary:

Each student demonstrates a proactive mindset and accomplishes learning goals.

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
McNally, Gina	Principal	The school-based Leadership Team meets once a month (or more if needed). The members will share any new school/district/state information with their respective grade groups/PLCs. Implement Blended ELA Curriculum, along with ongoing review of student data to determine strengths and deficiencies. The Leadership Team will work to develop ideas for teacher support as necessary and monitor professional development needs. Progress toward the school improvement goals will be discussed and reviewed as well to make sure the strategies are being implemented with fidelity. Leadership Team will provide ongoing support and professional development for Canvas as well as the blended reading curriculum. 1. Entire team will review/revise and finalize school goals, vision, and classroom mission statements 2. Gina McNally, Principal and JoBeth Davis, Assistant Administrator will complete a needs assessment to identify critical areas of support for students (staff surveys) 3. Leadership Team/Grade Chairs creates a para-professional support schedule. 4. Classroom teachers with MTSS district support develop and implement reading intervention using SRA Intervention Reading Program and Connect to Comprehension program for Tier III students. 4. Leadership Team/MTSS Team Analyze student academic achievement data to support goals aimed toward student growth and proficiency. 5. Leadership Team/All Faculty members will participate in and present relevant Professional Development Opportunities for faculty & staff. 6. Faculty will lead and facilitate Professional Learning Community meetings with established norms (SMART Goals, Common Formative & Summative Assessments, instruction focused on student results, gradual release model, Lesson prep protocol, data driven decisions on instruction). 7. Faculty will implement and monitor proactive grading procedures, vertical alignment of the gradebook categories and weighting in grades K-2 and 3-5. Teachers will refer and follow districtwide APP manual. 8. Faculty will provide consistent systems of communication with parents, guardians, and families (about student progress, student WIGS, behavior, modeled citizenship/leadership, and safety). School-wide implementation and use of DOJO to communicate with families. 9. Gina McNally & JoBeth Davis will collaborate and communicate with all faculty staff including non-core teachers: VPK, STEAM, Music, and PE). 10. Entire Faculty will actively establish and participate in committees that ensure student safety and success to include Threat Assessment Team, SAC, Leader in Me Team, MTSS Team, Mental Health Team & Behavior Team, SIP Team, Math/Science Team, ELA/Math Liaisons along with vertical PLC meetings per month. 11. Gina McNally/JoBeth Davis' Job will ensure that PLC meetings are held 1 day per week, and additional days as needed. 12. Kelly Lasko and Patty Emfinger will establish and maintain community partnerships in order to support students, parents, and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		families. Four Title 1 Nights including Leadership Day. 13. JoBeth Davis and Parent Liaison with the Leadership Team will establish and maintain community partnerships in order to support students, parents, and families. 14. Collaborate with administration, SAC and parent liaison to make decisions about the spending of Title I Funds. Title I Funds have been used to support students in the following ways: *Additional Staff (paraprofessionals to assist with SRA and ESE students) *Professional Development for teachers/staff (Achieve 3000, SRA, Leader in Me, Blended ELA curriculum) *Supplemental Instructional materials (DO the Math, Bay Lit Cafe, CPALMS) *Parent Involvement Activities -Provide students with interventions and remediation as mandated by the MTSS Process *MTSS: MTSS Specialist Diane Celestinni and Mrs. Mary-Margaret Register (Guidance Counselor) *Teachers will review, implement and monitor students' MTSS plans for Reading, Math, and behavior
Bigsby, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Jennings, Sayrah	Teacher, K-12	
Gunter, Alicia	Teacher, K-12	
Frith-Register, Mary-Margaret	School Counselor	
Mertes, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Thedford, Carla	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Josephine	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Jeffrey, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade
Lasko, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade
Emfinger, Patricia	Paraprofessional	Parent Liaison

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/6/2020, Gina Mcnally

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A

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

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	50	60	65	59	59	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Attendance below 90 percent	5	15	14	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/24/2020

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	64	71	63	77	62	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397
Attendance below 90 percent	14	26	17	19	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	6	3	14	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	10	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	2	3	12	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	3	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	64	71	63	77	62	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397
Attendance below 90 percent	14	26	17	19	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	6	3	14	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	10	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	2	3	12	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	3	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	42%	55%	57%	37%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	59%	58%	53%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	57%	53%	60%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	35%	56%	63%	44%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	46%	54%	62%	50%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	42%	51%	64%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	53%	53%	48%	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	53%	61%	-8%	58%	-5%
	2018	34%	57%	-23%	57%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	58%	-20%	58%	-20%
	2018	29%	51%	-22%	56%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	36%	56%	-20%	56%	-20%
	2018	25%	50%	-25%	55%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	63%	-20%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	59%	-18%	64%	-23%
	2018	41%	59%	-18%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison	0%					
Cohort Comparison	-2%					
05	2019	29%	54%	-25%	60%	-31%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison	-19%					
Cohort Comparison	-12%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	34%	54%	-20%	53%	-19%
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
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	50	57	19	45	50	17				
WHT	42	56	68	35	46	43	34				
FRL	44	56	63	35	48	44	38				
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	10	12	10	25	29	7	21				
WHT	32	29	25	42	44	31	43				
FRL	27	24	19	40	41	35	35				
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	11	37	42	20	34	57	30				
WHT	36	52	62	44	50	63	48				
FRL	37	53	62	42	49	70	42				

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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	323
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	46
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	47
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 data components that showed the lowest performance are Science and Math with 35% achievement. In both subject areas scores decreased in Science by 6% and Math by 9%. In comparison to both the district and state we are 18% below the average in Science. In Math, 21% of students scored below the district average and 28% below the state average. A contributing factor to our math scores would be the lack of fidelity by teachers while using the Eureka curriculum.

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

The component with the greatest decrease for the 2018-2019 school year was Math Achievement by 9%. In 2018 the Math achievement was 44% and in 2019 it decreased to 35%. A contributing factor to our math scores would be the lack of fidelity by teachers while using the Eureka curriculum. Another contributing factor was the lack of fundamental skills such as base ten, number sense, multiplication, division, fluency, addition and subtraction with multi-digit numbers, etc.

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

In 2019 the Math Achievement in the state was 63% and Waller Elementary scored at 35%. There was a 28% difference between Waller's scores and the State average in Math Achievement. Due to Hurricane Michael, students missed 5 consecutive weeks of instruction and practice.

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

The data component with the most improvement was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile with a 47% increase from 21% in 2018 to 68% in 2019. Waller Elementary implemented a school wide 30-minute intervention block with small group instruction using SRA and Connect to Comp. Data driven discussions took place during weekly PLC's to address summative and formative assessment data, MAP (NWEA) scores, and intervention data.

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

The two areas of concern according to the EWS data are attendance and students with Level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Increase Reading/Writing Proficiency with new blended curriculum.
2. Monthly look-fors in Math (for example:fluency).
3. Leader in Me/School-Wide Mentoring
4. Triad Team will be working along side the Guidance Department to reduce ODR's and increase attendance.
5. Targeted intervention for Tier III students based on the blended curriculum assessment results using SRA intervention.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Waller Elementary will increase student proficiency levels in the area of Reading, by identifying specific student needs and deficits and using appropriate data to plan and provide interventions and instruction. Rationale focusing on student needs will allow students to gain proficiency in Reading.
Measurable Outcome:	In order to improve our performance and increase student proficiency levels in the area of Reading on the FSA. 1. Increase ELA proficiency of all students to at least 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gina McNally (mcnalgl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	K-5 content based literacy which builds content knowledge with rich, authentic text. K-1 skills block which is 60 minutes of structured phonics (reading foundations). 2-5 Accelerated Learning Model which is 60 minutes of differentiated instruction building on the core content. Differentiated activities for MTSS and ESE supports to build on core content knowledge. K-5 Math curriculum which teaches number and operations using a developmental progression. Prepare problems and use them in whole-class instruction while assisting student in monitoring and reflection on the problem solving process. Shows visual representations, expose students to multiple problem solving strategies. Helps students recognize and articulate mathematical concepts and notation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The program embeds support for ELL, ESE, and students in MTSS and these supports address how information is presented, ways to engage students, and how students respond.

Action Steps to Implement

1. MAP testing/monitoring of students in the lowest quartile.
2. Classroom observations and teacher feedback.
3. MTSS data chats with teacher/administrations (MTSS Team) to discuss specific intervention strategy of individual students.
4. PARA support on each grade level for small group support and remediation using the blended curriculum.
5. Implement Accelerated Learning Model for ELA with one hour of content based literacy to build knowledge and one hour of differentiated instruction based on student needs.
6. Utilize Literacy Coach to supports needs for the blended ELA curriculum.

Person Responsible	Gina McNally (mcnalgl@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Of our 421 students in the 2019-2020 school year, 123 students had 1 or more referrals. There was a total of 259 referrals. Forty-One (41) of the referrals were assigned OSS, this resulted in 132 days of lost instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the amount of instructional time lost due to ISS and OSS by 30% and increase student engagement in the learning process through the development of academic goals and social behavior goals (student-led).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Josephine Davis (davisje@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of the Leader in Me process. Evidenced based, social-emotional program which identifies a negative school culture and provides on going teaching strategies to best meet students social-emotional and academic needs. Proven to raise student academic achievement. Promotes racial and socioeconmic diversity. Provides integrated curricula and instruction. Creates partnerships that enhance the school's theme in support of student well-being. Full implemenation of the District Mental Health Triad (at the school level) to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 Behavior program and improve student attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Waller Elementary students will achieve more and experience more academic success if classroom disruptions for behavior are limited and all students are in class and participating. Students who are disrupting class not only cause themselves to fall behind, but the rest of the class as well. Waller will/is participating in full implementation of the District Mental Health Triad (at the school level) to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 Behavior program and improve student attendance. Analysis of attendance data, along with behavior tracking will enable to team to determine additional supports for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Office discipline referrals will be monitored monthly through FOCUS by administration. Integrated during monthly MTSS meetings.
2. On-going discussions within the PLC and with the bus driver team with input from service providers. Notes documented (PLC) and submitted to administration weekly.
3. Teachers will provide 7-Habits curriculum/instruction and Leadership paradigms which enhance and support ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies curriculum.
4. Aministration will meet with students and monitor student leadership notebooks to ensure continued implementation of goal tracking and progress.
5. Ongoing coaching cycles with Leader in Me coach throughout the school-year as documented on the school wide calendar.
6. Mental Health Triad Team will provide preventative and intevention services to all Tier 2 and Tier 3 Behavior students as well as ESE students with behavior goals.

Person Responsible	Josephine Davis (davisje@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.

Students will receive intensive intervention through the school interventionist and with additional para support in the areas of deficiency. Students will also receive support from the Mental Health triad Team as it relates to the students' social emotional behavior goals in their IEP.

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.

Through the Leader in Me program we plan to build relationships with parents, families and our stakeholders together by developing school goals, striving to achieve excellence and engaging our learners by implementing schoolwide leaders through positive mindset. We will involve all members through virtual programs. Parent surveys, parent engagement, and community resources, the school will utilize training and relationship building opportunities to train, educate, and engage faculty and staff to strengthen the relationships with parents through communication, personal experience, and active partnership. In addition, the school will share information and solicit suggestions from Student Advisory Council (SAC). Waller staff, students and families will take part in the Measurable Results Survey (MRE) twice a year to gauge school climate and move forward in aligning school wide goals.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00