

Bay District Schools

Tommy Smith Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Tommy Smith Elementary School

5044 TOMMY SMITH DR, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Debra Spradley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 87% |
| 2019-20 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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (58%) |
| 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 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Tommy Smith Elementary School

5044 TOMMY SMITH DR, 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>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">84%</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;">21%</p> |

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission of the administration, faculty, staff, parents, and community of Tommy Smith Elementary School is to provide a caring environment in which every child is respected and provided with the opportunity to learn by helping students build a strong academic foundation and develop good character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tommy Smith Elementary School's vision is to empower students to be productive, life-learners by maximizing their potential in academics, citizenship, and character through creating a school culture that exemplifies being responsible, being respectful, working together, and being safe. Our goal is to help our students one day develop into productive members of society by meeting the educational, physical, social, and emotional needs of every child.

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 |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Spradley, Debra | Principal | <p>Principal duties and responsibilities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning; 2 Maintains a school climate that supports student engagement in learning; 3 Generates high expectations for learning growth by all students; and 4 Engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school. 5 Implement the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices as described in Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C., through a common language of instruction; 6 Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement; 7 Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance; 8 Implements the district's adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school; and 9 Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula. 10 Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan; 11 Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction; 12 Employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served; 13 Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology; Implements professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction; and 14 Provides resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year. 15 Maintains a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy; 16 Recognizes and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning; 17 Promotes school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students; 18 Provides recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment; Initiates and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being; and Engages faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps. 19 Gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency; 20 Uses critical thinking and problem-solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions; 21 Evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------|---|
| | | <p>implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed;</p> <p>22 Empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate; and</p> <p>23 Uses effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school.</p> <p>24 Identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders;</p> <p>25 Provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders;</p> <p>26 Plans for succession management in key positions;</p> <p>27 Promotes teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning; and</p> <p>28 Develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education, and business leaders.</p> <p>29 Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans;</p> <p>30 Establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization;</p> <p>31 Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development; and Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.</p> <p>32 Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders;</p> <p>33 Recognizes individuals for effective performance;</p> <p>34 Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community;</p> <p>35 Maintains high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engages stakeholders in the work of the school;</p> <p>36 Creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues.</p> <p>37 Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration; and Ensures faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions.</p> <p>38 Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C.</p> <p>39 Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership;</p> <p>40 Demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community;</p> <p>41 Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system; and Demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it;</p> <p>42 Demonstrates explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.</p> |
| Spivey, Virginia | Teacher, K-12 | |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Barth, Vern | Assistant Principal | |
| Ramey, Tonia | School Counselor | |
| Bruce, Scott | School Counselor | |
| Strickland, Myra | Teacher, ESE | |
| Arthur, Alison | Teacher, K-12 | Teacher |
| Rogers, Denise | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Huber, Joy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Hutchison, Candi | Teacher, K-12 | Kdg Teacher |
| Blundon, Wendy | Teacher, K-12 | 1st grade teacher |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Debra Spradley

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.*

4

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

29

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) | 87% |
| 2019-20 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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (58%) |
| 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 . | |

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 | 67 | 70 | 96 | 78 | 80 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 468 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 12 | 18 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

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 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/2/2020

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 | 72 | 89 | 92 | 106 | 83 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 541 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |

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 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 | 72 | 89 | 92 | 106 | 83 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 541 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |

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 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 | 65% | 55% | 57% | 55% | 49% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 61% | 59% | 58% | 60% | 54% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 54% | 57% | 53% | 52% | 55% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 65% | 56% | 63% | 70% | 52% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 60% | 54% | 62% | 74% | 55% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 40% | 42% | 51% | 60% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 62% | 53% | 53% | 56% | 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 | 61% | 61% | 0% | 58% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 57% | 16% | 57% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 62% | 58% | 4% | 58% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 51% | -5% | 56% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 58% | 56% | 2% | 56% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 50% | 14% | 55% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 12% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 62% | 62% | 0% | 62% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 80% | 63% | 17% | 62% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 60% | 59% | 1% | 64% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 59% | -4% | 62% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -20% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 63% | 54% | 9% | 60% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 57% | 21% | 61% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 60% | 54% | 6% | 53% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 54% | 19% | 55% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| 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 | 44 | 50 | 40 | 41 | 27 | 13 | | | | |
| BLK | 62 | | | 23 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | 38 | | 75 | 69 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 63 | 57 | 67 | 62 | 45 | 59 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 62 | 53 | 63 | 56 | 32 | 58 | | | | |
| 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 | 42 | 44 | 29 | 49 | 56 | 31 | 47 | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | | | 57 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | 73 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 49 | 39 | 72 | 64 | 39 | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 56 | 43 | 32 | 65 | 59 | 28 | 69 | | | | |
| 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 | 26 | 42 | 31 | 42 | 58 | 47 | 29 | | | | |
| BLK | 62 | 80 | | 69 | 60 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 71 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 59 | 52 | 69 | 75 | 62 | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 56 | 54 | 65 | 70 | 55 | 50 | | | | |

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 | 58 |
| 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 | 407 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 34 |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 43 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 61 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 component that showed the lowest performance for our school is our students with disabilities at 34%. The following were contributing factors for the lower performance for this subgroup. First, Hurricane Michael in 2018 and the COVID pandemic of 2019-2020 impacted both emotional well being and academic gains. We estimate that our students have lost approximately 14 weeks of learning over the last two years due to these two situations. This subgroup statistically loses academic growth each summer which also is a factor. This loss of true academic time has impacted routines, normalcy, and school structure. Based on the data analysis of this subgroup it was concluded that language barriers and reading comprehension that are required in assessments have affected ELA and the application of science and math knowledge causing areas of unfinished learning. Another factor that has contributed to the low performance was the lack of PLC days and PLC time due to having regular days added to make up lost instruction time in 2018-19 and now the loss of PLC planning days in 2020-21 due to delayed start from COVID.

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

The area that showed the greatest decline from the prior year's data was in the area of math, particularly in the student subgroup that represents our lowest quartile. The factors that are contributing to the decline include loss of school (we estimate about 14 weeks total over the last two years combined), inconsistent curriculum, lack of FSA tutoring due to COVID this past spring. This loss of true academic time has impacted routines, normalcy, and school structure. Our students have been impacted both in emotional well being as well as in academic gains. Based on the data analysis of this subgroup it was concluded that the time missed has greatly impacted vocabulary and comprehension which in turn has created a barrier affecting the intended application of math curriculum. Another factor that contributed to the low performance was the lack of PLC days and PLC time due to having regular days added to make up lost instruction time in 2018-19 and now the loss of PLC planning days in 2020-21 due to delayed start from COVID.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the lowest 25% in Math. The factor that we believe may have contributed to areas of unfinished learning was the hurricane in 2018 and COVID during the last school year. Upon return from the hurricane, we were directed to use a modified pacing guide to adjust for lost classroom time. We feel that there were some standards that were not covered during this period. Another factor that has impacted learning gains is the COVID pandemic of academic school year 2019-2020. This resulted in our students being out of a structured school setting for nine weeks. We also feel that with the extended summer following the missed classroom time added to this area of unfinished learning. Other factors that have contributed are the absence of PLC days, and lack of participation in after school tutoring attendance that traditionally takes place each spring in preparation for FSA. Based on the data analysis of this subgroup the extended time missed did impact the conceptual and procedural learning processes related to the continuum of mathematical instruction resulting in areas of unfinished learning especially in assessment areas with those containing word problems.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in achievement, gains and the overall score was ELA both overall and in the lowest 25% of students. The actions that our school took that we felt helped with our improvement in ELA was implementing PAWS (remediation and enrichment time) with consistency and the supports put into place with push in paras and teachers to help students in classrooms. Other actions include the addition of Scholastic Readers and Coach Books that were integrated across the ELA curriculum. We believe these resources contributed to the increase because the material within the Readers was of high interest and relevant non-fiction standard-based materials. One new action that we are taking this year is being flexible on the use of instructional materials. We are shifting our focus to offer a variety of sources as part of our instructional materials that will be used to cover the curriculum. In acquiring a variety of sources, we hope to accelerate learning as our belief for this is that we will be presenting the strongest sources of materials for our students to learn from. Another action we feel helped was a school goal to work to reduce distractions, alleviate interruptions, and protect instructional time as much as possible.

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

1. Level 1 on statewide assessments
2. Course failures in ELA or Math

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

1. Improve our FSA scores for students with disabilities
2. Improve FSA Science Scores
3. Improve FSA Math Scores - lowest 25%
4. Continue to build on our FSA ELA scores
5. Continue with PBIS and school expectations to continue to see office referrals decline

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Within our academic area of focus, we will work to increase 10% overall in science, math, ELA to target our subgroups SWD and the lowest 25% of math achievers

Measurable Outcome: Based on the data analysis of school data on FSA scores we will strive to increase at least 10% overall in science, math, and ELA to target our subgroups of SWD and the lowest 25% of math achievers to meet the targeted goal on FSA and raise our current achievement level of 34% to 41% or higher for the SWD subgroup. This will also help our lowest 25% of math students move above the average district math scores and approach the state average math achievement level of 51%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Debra Spradley (spradld@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. PAWS Groups (enrichment, remediation, and assessment groups)
2. We will use accelerated learning strategies to address unfinished learning areas.
3. As a school, we will integrate science standards within other academic subjects.
4. Increase the focus on application/word problems in Eureka Math lessons.
5. Implement FSA after school tutoring in the spring that will be about 45 to 60 minutes per session.
6. We will use a variety of sources to drive instruction and provide the strongest sources of curriculum to our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These evidence-based strategies have been shown through research to be effective in helping increase student achievement. The evidence that we use to determine the success of these strategies includes MAP data, prior FSA scores, PLC discussions, classroom assessments, both formative and summative, teacher observations, and parent feedback.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use MAP scores to identify the lowest 25% in math, reading, & science specifically target these students in each class and grade level. MAP data will be collected in the fall, winter, and spring and analyzed by PLCs to further determine areas of need.
2. Teachers will continuously analyze common formative and summative assessment data collected and analyzed by PLCs weekly. Assessment data, along with MAPS assessment results within professional learning communities are used to identify strengths and weaknesses in order to drive instructional decisions in Tier I and Tier II.
3. Teachers, Paras, and support personnel will continue to implement and use P.A.W.S. group time, which will be used to correct and fill in areas of unfinished learning and reassess these standards. The School Leadership Team and Administration will work together to analyze classroom data during monthly meetings and re-evaluate assessment concepts to determine the effectiveness of implementation.
4. Use classroom assessments (formative and summative) aligned to standards to measure classroom growth.
5. To ensure fidelity, classroom walkthroughs, observations, and viewing of canvas lessons will be used as a progress monitoring tool by administration.

Person Responsible Debra Spradley (spradld@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The rationale for this goal is to help reduce the loss of instructional time by students who violate school rules and the consequences result in a time out from the classroom due to administration visits, time outs, detentions, and ISS in the school promise room or out of school suspensions. The belief is that our programs help build self-confidence and intrinsic motivation in the learning environment which in turns helps with peer conflicts and overcoming adversity and challenging situations

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome that our school plans to achieve is to reduce our student discipline referrals at least 5% through teaching, modeling, and building of appropriate behaviors and character.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Vern Barth (barthvl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: TSE will utilize two different strategies to assist with school behaviors aside from office referrals. The first is ClassDojo. This is a classroom communication app used between parents and teachers. It connects parents and teachers on a student's conduct and performance through real-time reports as well as a feed for photos and videos during the school day. Evidence proves that increased parental communication assists in improving classroom behaviors. Another strategy is the use of PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention System). This uses evidence-based prevention and intervention practices along a multi-tiered continuum that supports the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral competence of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research and evidence tell us by reducing the negative, disruptive or distracting behaviors, we can enhance and improve the chances that effective teaching and learning will occur in the classroom, both for the students exhibiting problem behaviors and for their classmates. Within our PBIS program, all students receive prevention strategies delivered at the school-wide and classroom levels. We use a data tracking google form to accumulate data that is called Minor Infraction form that aligns with a classroom management flowchart to help teachers determine classroom managed behaviors vs administratively managed behaviors. In this model, all prevention and intervention strategies focus on identifying socially appropriate replacement behavior, specifically teaching the replacement behavior, and using a variety of consequential strategies to minimize reinforcement of problem behavior. We reward positive behaviors and discourage negative or inappropriate behaviors through our school-based PBIS program. Specific strategies we will use that align with our school PBIS plan include distribution of panther bucks, schoolwide recognition opportunities on our ITV, grade level and individual class celebrations, incentives both within the classroom & school-wide as well as tracking behaviors using data to problem-solve solutions and recognize potential patterns used in prevention.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Character Ed - The school will host a 15 to 20 minute block of character education following a set curriculum that is used in many areas around the school.
2. PBIS - Tommy Smith is a PBIS school. Our PBIS team for this school year will meet monthly to support teachers with the implementation of PBIS classroom plans, analyze discipline data, and organize school-wide events promoting positive behavior. The team will consist of members from each grade level.
3. MTSS - Work on the tier 1 behavior classroom plans. Tommy Smith Elementary will utilize a PROMISE room and the BDS TRIAD team to help reduce negative behaviors and allow students to return to class in

a timely manner without the need for office discipline referrals or ISS/OSS. Teachers will use a discipline flow chart to determine the level of the infraction (minor-major) as well as when to send a student to the PROMISE room before behavior turns into an office discipline referral.

4. We will be integrating the use of our Bay District Schools TRIAD mental health team as part of our classroom management and behavior plans for tier 2 and tier 3 students, to support our guidance and administration in providing a safe and supportive school environment.

5. We will use data from our school's Minor Infraction Form to help record and track behaviors and also to create problem-solving solutions and find ways to take a proactive approach to areas that need improvement.

Person Responsible Vern Barth (barthvl@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.

1. School safety:

One of the ways Tommy Smith adheres to safety on our campus is by using feedback from the district school safety assessment team that came to our school to assess strengths and weaknesses. We also used the FSSA to update school information and safety information. Tommy Smith Administration and our School Safety Officer oversee strict implementation of school, district, and state safety procedures and regulations especially those related to the Florida Senate Bill 7030 and 7026 or the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act to include locking of doors, safety window film, camera installation, manned open gates, locked entryways of exterior entrances and internal egress, trained SSO on campus, increased security measures for screening to include strict use of the RAPTOR system of all visitors without an approved badge. Other measures will include sanitation and CDC precautions being followed as related to COVID to prevent or reduce the potential for outbreak resulting in loss of time from school. We are using minimal class movement, social distancing as much as possible, promoting the wearing of masks, and implementation of new arrival and dismissal procedures to include using numbers for students instead of names for a more secure process.

2. Building stakeholder relationships:

Tommy Smith will utilize a School Advisory Council to help assist school leaders with school-based decisions. This council is made up of teachers, administrators, parents, community leaders, and business partners. During our SAC meetings, team leaders, administrators, and guests share current events and other exciting information taking place in the life of our school. Teachers at our school continuously encourage all of our parents to join and utilize Parent Portal. Our administration and district personnel help maintain social media streams such as Facebook and Twitter so that families may have access to a wide variety of resources. Teachers use a communication tool called Class Dojo to convey student information and campus information with parents along with sharing of good happenings from our school.

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.

Increase parental involvement of all students to provide parents resources for supporting school-based literacy efforts through varied formats (Family Literacy events, website, LINK Alerts, social media, Parent Portal and Parent Liason contacts). There will be a focused effort to increase involvement for parents of students identified as at-risk through academic and behavioral data.

Tommy Smith has several programs and supports available to ensure the social-emotional needs of all students are being met. Our teachers teach and reteach school expectations. We use character education programs in conjunction with the needs of students with our PBIS program. We have two counselors who are available to work with individual and small groups of children that are having difficulty behaviorally, socially, or emotionally. We have an intervention teacher that also helps target student academic and behavioral needs. Our counselors provide grade-level guidance lessons based on data and targeted grade level behaviors during the character education block. We provide emotional and social support to students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 based on student needs and MTSS plans discussed each month at the data chats. Tier 2 supports include social skills groups, ZooU, check-in/out, and mentoring. Tier 3 supports are determined based on specific student needs and team decisions. We utilize the resources provided to us for social and emotional support such as a School Psychologist for evaluations, Florida Therapy for more specialized counseling, Elevate Bay mentors. and Military Family Life Counselors for our military students and classes. TSE uses a Promise Room para to help students who have difficulty adhering to school norms and discipline policies. We have a Telehealth portal available to help students and parents that assist them in accessing needed health services. Our parent liaison and counselors also work diligently to meet the needs of students by using check-in/ check-out interventions, contacting parents, and providing community resources as needed. Our parent liaison also assists with attendance and provides the administration with any concerns that may arise. Our counselors will complete community of care referrals for outside services to allow our school to provide onsite services to students and families in need.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |