

Bay District Schools

Breakfast Point Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Breakfast Point Academy

601 N RICHARD JACKSON BLVD, Panama City Beach, FL 32407

<https://breakfastpoint.bay.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Clint Whitfield

Start Date for this Principal: 9/14/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Breakfast Point Academy

601 N RICHARD JACKSON BLVD, Panama City Beach, FL 32407

<https://breakfastpoint.bay.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>63%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>28%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

Breakfast Point Academy will provide a positive and safe learning environment fostering mutual respect among community, staff, and students by supporting diverse learners. We hold high expectations for our students as they grow into productive, knowledgeable, and responsible citizens who value life-long learners.

One heart, one school, one vision...Every Ray, Every Day!

Each and every child can learn, and we will establish high standards of learning that we expect all student to achieve.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe in unlocking the leadership potential in every student through academics, relationships, and service to prepare them for future success in college, the workforce, and beyond.

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
Whitfield, Clint	Principal	
Christopher, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	
Bailey, Janet	School Counselor	
Jones, Robin	School Counselor	
Shumate, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Kirk, Elise	Teacher, K-12	
Monduy, Elena	Teacher, K-12	
Emery, Kendall	Teacher, K-12	
Hobbs, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Youngblood, Alex	Teacher, K-12	
Rivers, Darnita	Assistant Principal	
Cryderman, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Clegg, Mary K	Teacher, ESE	
Kelly, Mitch	Assistant Principal	
Noble, Carolyn	Teacher, K-12	
Dawson, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/14/2020, Clint Whitfield

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.*

6

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

90

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	102	113	123	107	107	105	144	126	114	0	0	0	0	1041
Attendance below 90 percent	30	16	31	23	18	22	27	33	18	0	0	0	0	218
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	14	30	23	17	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	35	25	18	0	0	0	0	92

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	0	7	10	30	19	13	0	0	0	0	80

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	1	2	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	59%	73%	61%	58%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	64%	59%	63%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	58%	54%	48%	56%	51%
Math Achievement	67%	70%	62%	66%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	57%	57%	59%	67%	59%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	56%	52%	57%	58%	50%
Science Achievement	62%	65%	56%	54%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	86%	78%	89%	79%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	57%	61%	-4%	58%	-1%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	58%	2%	58%	2%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	48%	56%	-8%	56%	-8%
	2018	35%	50%	-15%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2019	54%	56%	-2%	54%	0%
	2018	56%	51%	5%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
07	2019	59%	54%	5%	52%	7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	61%	51%	10%	51%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	65%	59%	6%	56%	9%
	2018	65%	58%	7%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	59%	1%	64%	-4%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
	2018	54%	57%	-3%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019	53%	53%	0%	55%	-2%
	2018	75%	52%	23%	52%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
07	2019	69%	59%	10%	54%	15%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	54%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	63%	48%	15%	46%	17%
	2018	71%	48%	23%	45%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	53%	-1%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	66%	51%	15%	48%	18%
	2018	63%	49%	14%	50%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	74%	6%	71%	9%
2018	83%	76%	7%	71%	12%
Compare		-3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	64%	30%	61%	33%
2018	92%	64%	28%	62%	30%
Compare		2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	62%	38%	57%	43%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	56%	-56%
Compare		100%			

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	23	49	42	39	53	53	29	46			
ELL	39	72	67	68	74	63					
ASN	61	69		83	85						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	47	46	50	38	46	46	50				
HSP	49	57	52	62	52	44	47	81			
MUL	65	71		67	64		71	80			
WHT	61	63	49	68	57	61	64	86	77		
FRL	53	60	46	58	54	49	53	79	64		
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	24	37	31	35	46	38	32	57			
ELL	29	50	69	52	55	40					
ASN	58	71		84	76						
BLK	31	52	64	38	50	47	45				
HSP	46	50	38	58	52	40	43				
MUL	60	57	44	70	68		63				
WHT	58	53	34	69	67	50	65	86	85		
FRL	44	46	39	57	61	47	56	67	55		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	44	43	35	44	37	7	65			
ELL	52	57	50	61	71	71	27				
ASN	67	69		94	71						
BLK	50	61	54	41	59	50	18	82			
HSP	46	47	32	57	69	58	46				
MUL	42	44		68	70		55				
WHT	61	66	51	68	67	60	57	89	72		
FRL	47	57	45	54	62	57	44	83	43		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	630
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
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	
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	65
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	58
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.

When reviewing the data, our lowest 25% and SWD showed the lowest performance. Although we saw growth in both ELA and Math within our lowest 25%, it is still an area in which we need to focus. Often we see that our SWD fall within the range of our lowest 25%, so we want to make that a priority this year.

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

We did not see any significant declines from the previous year, but we do know that our current 7th grade cohort may need some extra focus. Although not part of our numbers, we had an increase of students after the hurricane that do show an academic need based on current and previous performance on FSA and in the classroom.

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.

We noticed that our ELA lowest 25% was at 49% while the state average was 55% percent. We are hopeful that our new aligned curriculum will help close this gap. We are hopeful that a vetted curriculum that has alignment to the standards, with additional district supports, will help us close this gap.

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

We witnessed significant jumps in all areas of ELA and Math, and we attribute this to more of a focus on student needs and grade level PLCs. This previous year, we began to focus more on the needs of the students, and planning and preparing with them in mind.

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

Attendance is a major area of concern, with 218 students with attendance below 90 percent. That is a significant amount of instruction missed. We did utilize incentive programs with recognitions, pizza parties, and door prizes.

Another area of concern is our 6th grade class, which has 30 students exhibiting two or more indicators. I believe this should be an area of focus with my Leadership Team, and not specifically with those who teach the 6th grade students, but those in elementary who might help identify these students and recognize trends.

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

1. Accelerated Learning
2. Instructional Support
3. Attendance
4. Identifying lowest 35% and meeting their needs
5. Providing a safe learning environment for students and teachers

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To increase student achievement through standards-based instruction that meets the intent and rigor of the standard(s) being taught.

To increase student achievement as measured by MAP (K-2) and FSA (3-8) with an emphasis on making learning gains within our lowest 35% and ESE students.

Measurable Outcome: We hope to increase our ELA and Math Lowest 25% by at least 5% as measured by FSA and MAP (FSA increase was 10% for ELA and 8% for Math this previous year, but these numbers still represented the lowest performing subgroup within all of them). We also hope to see a 5% increase in our SWD as measure by FSA and MAP. These students could fall within subgroups, so it allows us more focus on achievement.

Although our data only shows the lowest 25%, we will target the extra 10 percent through PLCs, data chats, and progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will continue the use of our PLCs on grade levels and across content areas. We will utilize Eureka Math and EL for ELA to ensure our instruction and materials are being taught and provided with the intent and rigor of the standard(s) being addressed. We will continue progress monitoring students through the PLC process as well as through monthly data chats with teachers, staff, and intervention teachers. We will also share this data with paraprofessionals who are providing direct instruction to students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We believe that the PLC process is multi-faceted as it focuses on instruction, planning, and student achievement. We will continue to implement Eureka and EL, both of which are proven to be aligned to the Florida Standards. We will monitor student progress and needs through being present at PLCs as well as discussing students of concern at our monthly data chats. We will also continue to incorporate more technology-based delivery methods to assist our students through BayLink via Canvas and other platforms.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We want to continue to implement classroom and school-wide expectations to improve the overall school culture for our students, teachers, and community. We believe it is very important that we focus on keeping students in class through restorative justice and character education. If students are not at school, they cannot learn. We will also dig deeper into our EWS data to identify at risk students who exhibit two indicators.

Measurable Outcome: As a school, we want to decrease office discipline referrals by at least 10% as measured by district data reports and FOCUS data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will continue to implement our PBIS school-wide expectations and strategies in conjunction with restorative practices. We will also provide ongoing support to teachers and staff that assist in creating consistent responses to behavior as well as incentives that are appropriately aligned to PBIS expectations. We will also used CORE ESSENTIALS as our baseline character ed program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS is a research-based program that, if implemented with fidelity, can help improve the school culture and cut down on office discipline referrals. We will also use restorative practices to foster relationships with students and parents in order to provide a multi-tiered approach to responding to student behavior. This is a continuation of last year's strategy as we saw a drastic dip in office referrals from the previous year to this year (934 total in 2018-19, 570 in 2018-2019, and 444 in 2019-2020).

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Our administrative team will utilize feedback cycles to teachers to ensure effective instructional practices and standards-based instruction are being implemented at Breakfast Point.

Measurable Outcome: The administrative team will engage in no less than 3 CWT feedback cycles with our specific PLC members throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing a universal CWT walkthrough form, our administrative team will perform classroom walkthroughs with our teachers and provide feedback. We will use the digital form, based much on TNTPs guidance as well as the standards of rigor, to take notes and provide feedback to teachers. We will use a "notice and wonder" strategy to ask questions related to, but not limited to, content, instruction, environment, classroom management. We will then have a followup meeting with the teacher after the walkthrough, discuss the feedback and provide guidance for implementation as well as strategies and research-based practices, if necessary. We will then plan a return visit to see the strategies implemented, followed by another meeting to discuss progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We believe that getting into the classrooms is important for many reasons, but we want our teachers to understand we are there to support them, as well as learn alongside them. Teachers appreciate specific feedback that is constructive, and we want to assist them in implementing strategies that will have the most effective and timely impact on student achievement, teacher growth, and school-wide consistency. It will also allow us to pair teachers together who have similar needs, and/or utilize teachers on our campus to assist others who may need assistance in implementing different instructional strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our school leadership team will continue to implement classroom walk-throughs and implement effective feedback cycles to our teachers. We will focus on "prescribed PD," which will be timely and relevant strategies that can be implemented to have the greatest amount of impact on student learning and teacher instruction. As a leadership team, we will identify school-wide trends and needs and make adjustments as needed.

Our Administrative team will visit grade-level and subject area PLCs on Thursdays to ensure we are available for guidance and questions to ensure implementation of standards-based instruction as well as student data being discussed.

In regards to our Behavior goal, we will continue to monitor school-wide trends through our PBIS tracking form that teachers utilize. Our PBIS team meets once a month to discuss student discipline data as well as plan incentives for students through the utilization of Sand Dollars and Ray Cards.

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.

Breakfast Point Academy uses a comprehensive approach to support positive relationships with parents and increase family involvement. We promote effective school-to-home and home-to-school communication about student progress, school events, educational programs including but not limited to social media, websites, LINK alerts, emails, bulletins, and our welcome marquee. We also keep our community informed via social media. Parents are encouraged to become active members of the Parent Portal student account. This is an up-to-date account of student attendance, grades, behavior, etc.

Because of COVID, and specific restrictions on volunteers and campus visitors, we are looking at innovative ways to continue community involvement. We are going to work with community partners to provide opportunities to for our students and staff that will define new areas of support and volunteers. We will work with our Volunteer Liaison to find new ways to provide parental and community involvement. We will continue to use our PTO as a community partner and connection to others to provide as much involvement as we can!

BPA promotes PBIS school-wide expectations as well as promoting character ed through our Core Essentials program. Our school-based Leadership Team is involved with making important decisions about our school and community, and we also utilize our School Advisory Council to engage stakeholders.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00