Bay District Schools

West Bay Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

West Bay Elementary School

14813 SCHOOL DR, Panama City Beach, FL 32413

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Deniece Moss

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2020-21 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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 9/28/2021.

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

West Bay Elementary School

14813 SCHOOL DR, Panama City Beach, FL 32413

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	83%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

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.

Every kid by name and need!
West Bay Elementary's staff, parents, and community are dedicated to provide an engaging supportive environment for all scholars by implementing ambitious instruction, collaborative teaching, effective leadership, and involved families to empower our scholars to be lifelong learners.
Our students will achieve high levels of individual success both academically and in life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision for West Bay Elementary School is to prepare, motivate, and engage our scholars for a quickly changing world by instilling in each scholar critical thinking skills and a respect for core values of empathy, kindness, courage and harmony. Students will have success for today and be prepared for tomorrow.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moss, Deniece	Principal	As principal, it is vital that we know every child by name and need and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As administrators, it is our responsibility to guide conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and provide shared leadership opportunities.
Good, Michelle	Assistant Principal	As assistant administrator, it is vital we know every child by name and need and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior,and emotional learning goals for all students.As administrators, it is our responsibility to guide conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and provide shared leadership opportunities.
Dean, Kelly	School Counselor	As a guidance counselor representative on SBLT, it is vital we know each child by name and need and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Schmidt, Jane	Instructional Media	As a special area teacher and 3-5 interventionist representative on SBLT, it is vital we know each child by name and need and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Stark, Donna	Teacher, K-12	As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we know each child by name and need and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Gumataotao, Brooke	Teacher, ESE	As an ESE teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we know each child by name and need and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Jimenez, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Jennifer Jimenez, a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we know each child by name and need and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
White, Amy	Teacher, K-12	As a teacher representative on SBLT, it is vital we know each child by name and need and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Champagne, Ashley	Paraprofessional	As a support staff representative, it is vital we know each child by name and need and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students. As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.
Sulphur, Amanda	SAC Member	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/22/2017, Deniece Moss

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
18

Total number of students enrolled at the school
310

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	40	51	52	55	52	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305
Attendance below 90 percent	29	13	14	14	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	10	12	15	23	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	1	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/8/2021

2020-21 - 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	53	49	55	43	47	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306
Attendance below 90 percent	10	12	11	13	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	53	49	55	43	47	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306
Attendance below 90 percent	10	12	11	13	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				66%	55%	57%	63%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	59%	58%	58%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	57%	53%	53%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	56%	63%	68%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				77%	54%	62%	83%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	42%	51%	65%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	53%	53%	57%	50%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	56%	2%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	59%	22%	64%	17%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The data below was pulled from the school's NWEA MAP assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			77
	Economically Disadvantaged			69
	Students With Disabilities			58
	English Language Learners			50
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			79
	Economically Disadvantaged			71
	Students With Disabilities			67
	English Language Learners			75

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			66
	Economically Disadvantaged			62
	Students With Disabilities			36
	English Language Learners			67
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			68
	Economically Disadvantaged			71
	Students With Disabilities			36
	English Language Learners			67

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			68
	Economically Disadvantaged			70
	Students With Disabilities			29
	English Language Learners			25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			42
	Economically Disadvantaged			58
	Students With Disabilities			20
	English Language Learners			50

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			56
	Economically Disadvantaged			60
	Students With Disabilities			33
	English Language Learners			67
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			54
	Economically Disadvantaged			47
	Students With Disabilities			42
	English Language Learners			33

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			42
	Economically Disadvantaged			35
	Students With Disabilities			13
	English Language Learners			33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			42
	Economically Disadvantaged			27
	Students With Disabilities			13
	English Language Learners			50
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			34
	Economically Disadvantaged			31
	Students With Disabilities			25
	English Language Learners			33

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	36			25							
ELL	27			58							
HSP	37			58							
WHT	54	53		61	71		69				
FRL	45	50		53	76		61				

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	30	19		33	41						
ELL											
HSP	47	40		53	45						
WHT	69	60	50	72	82	65	69				
FRL	61	54	50	63	69	53	44				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	30	43		41	57						
HSP	45			45							
WHT	64	57	50	70	83	62	58				
FRL	58	54	46	63	87	70	55				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

At West Bay, we have continued to see a decline in ELA with our SWD subgroup in all grade levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students with Disabilities in ELA

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Action Step:
Change from a 3-5 ESE self contained model to a full inclusion model for our SWD scholars.
New ELA Standards Based reading curriculum

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Data unchanged from September 2019 as 2019 FSA was not taken. NWEA MAP data will be taken into consideration along with cohort data for current 5th-grade students comparing their academic performance to their 2018 FSA and current MAP.

The data component that showed the most improvement was:
1. ELA Achievement in 3rd grade (67% to 73%)

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We attribute this to our focus on knowing each student by name and need and having a strong team of individuals to implement interventions and monitor the data regularly. Our team did a great job of identifying those students and providing . The mobility rate of students is an ongoing concern. We will be monitoring our FTE Survey 2 in October and FTE Survey 4 in February to correctly identify our students included in the denominator for school grade calculations. We did not have any students who scored below a level 2 who was included in our school grade calculation.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

1. Implementing a TAG program K-5 with a certified gifted teacher
2. Increase student engagement in the classrooms
3. Intervention/enrichment dedicated times throughout the school day

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

1. Foundations PD on PLCs
2. Foundations PD on Learning Environment and Behavior Expectations
3. Foundations PD on MTSS Expectations
4. Foundations PD on Meeting the Need of Each Learner
5. Foundations PD on Assessment Principle and Practices and Grading Teacher Guide

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

1. Full inclusion model will be implemented school wide.
2. Fulltime, certified reading interventionist K-5

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our scholars in the lowest quartile for ELA decreased from 53% to 40% in proficiency over the past two years.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal at West Bay Elementary is to increase the percent proficient in the ELA lowest quartile from 40% to 60%.
Monitoring:	1. Identify the scholars in the lowest quartile in 5th grade 2. Monthly data chats to review scholar data 3. Monthly FSA style progress monitoring 4. Acceleration Meetings 5. Provide acceleration for scholars in lowest quartile
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deniece Moss (mossjd@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Based ELA curriculum (HMH) and resources including utilizing the district pacing guide and resources provided by the district.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly mentoring of the lowest quartile scholars will help the scholars to set goals and monitor the goals. Intensive reading intervention for those who are more than a year behind grade level.

Action Steps to Implement

The goal at West Bay Elementary is to increase the percent proficient in the ELA lowest quartile from 40% to 60%.
Identify the scholars in the lowest quartile in 4th and 5th grade
Monthly data chats to review scholar data
Monthly FSA style progress monitoring
Acceleration Meetings
Provide acceleration for scholars in lowest quartile

Person Responsible	Deniece Moss (mossjd@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities (ELA) Rationale The ESSA Data for the SWD subgroup decreased to 31% from 43% proficiency in 2019.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal at West Bay is to increase the Students with Disabilities ESSA Subgroup from 31% proficient to 50% in ELA.
Monitoring:	The students with disabilities will receive on grade level instruction using the resources provided by the district and instruction provided by a teacher certified to teach students with disabilities. Their grades will be monitored through monthly data chats and PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deniece Moss (mossjd@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Full inclusion school wide and implementing standards based ELA curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The students with disabilities will receive on grade level instruction using the resources provided by the district and instruction provided by a teacher certified to teach students with disabilities by using a full inclusion model school wide.

Action Steps to Implement

The goal at West Bay is to increase the Students with Disabilities ESSA Subgroup from 31% proficient to 50%.
ELA support for teachers through acceleration
Identify the lowest quartile for ELA
Monthly data chats to review scholar data
Acceleration meetings
Full implementation of inclusion

Person Responsible	Deniece Moss (mossjd@bay.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	West Bay will continue to implement a school wide character education program to assist in decreasing the number of behavior referrals. Teachers will continue to utilize morning meetings, meditation, and the implementation of the House System (Courage, Harmony, Empathy, and Kindness). In addition to these two programs, teachers will utilize the district Student Wellness Team as well as the character education lessons provided by the district and implemented school wide and in small groups.
Measurable Outcome:	West Bay will continue to have minimal ODRs for the 2021-20212 school year. The goal is to have less than 50 total office discipline referrals.
Monitoring:	FOCUS Report Monthly Data Chat
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Good (goodlm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Character Education Curriculum designed to meet the needs of our scholars Behavior Interventionist and Triad to monitor and assist with behavior interventions Implementation of the HOUSE System and celebrations Support of coaching when needed
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Triad Team HOUSE System Acceleration Meetings

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Florida State Assessment measures students' ability to demonstrate mastery of state standards in ELA. Students scoring a Level 3 or above are considered to meet grade level mastery of state standards measured on the FSA. Based on the released data 45% of tested fourth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 14% of tested fourth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 59% of fourth graders that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in grade 4 will demonstrate an increase of at least 3 percent increase in the percentage of proficient students on the 2022 FSA ELA. This will increase proficiency from 41% to 44%.
Monitoring:	Student progress will be monitored through teacher observation, formative and summative assessments, diagnostic assessments and progress monitoring probes. Teachers will meet weekly in PLCs to discuss and monitor student progress and classroom data. Student progress will also be monitored through iReady Diagnostic assessments three times per year and more frequently through Growth Monitoring Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deniece Moss (mossjd@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Bay County has adopted a new state approved ELA Curriculum , Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, which is correlated with the new FL BEST Standards. This curriculum is designed to provide quality instruction on the new BEST standards through a gradual release model starting with whole group lessons then allowing students to interact with the text and practice the skills in small group and individualized activities. In addition the curriculum includes Table Top lessons designed to differentiate instruction in small groups and enables grade level texts to be accessible to all learners. In addition, the curriculum includes Table Top lessons for ELL students allowing them to access and interact with grade level texts and skills as well. Along with the implementation of the HMH curriculum, students' progress will also be monitored through iReady. Students will participate in diagnostic assessments in Fall, Winter and Spring. This diagnostic data will be used to identify students that need additional support and interventions. In addition students will be assigned individualized lessons to address learning deficits. Students will participate in growth monitoring assessments more frequently in order to determine student progress and needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Into Reading core adopted instructional materials for K-5 English Language Arts. The series was reviewed and approved by the FLDOE for inclusion on the State Adopted List at time of adoption and purchase. To improve instruction and learning, BDS teachers incorporate explicit, direct instruction (effect size of .60) adn scaffolding (effect size of. 82) based on Hattie's research (Visible Learning: John Hattie 2017)
Action Steps to Implement	

Teachers will participate in Houghton Mifflin Harcourt virtual training facilitated by district ELA Instructional Specialists. This series of training will guide teachers in the implementation of the curriculum. Follow-up trainings will be conducted both virtually and in person by the district's ELA Instructional Specialists.

Person Responsible	Deniece Moss (mossjd@bay.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will meet in PLCs to analyze formative and summative assessment data along with iReady diagnostic and growth monitoring data. Administrators will take part in these PLC meetings to ensure that

the curriculum is being instructed with fidelity and that students are receiving necessary support and interventions.

Person Responsible Deniece Moss (mossjd@bay.k12.fl.us)

For any student who has not responded to a specific reading intervention delivered with fidelity and with the initial intensity provided (time and group size), reading intervention instruction and/or materials may be changed based on student data. Diagnostic assessments will be required to identify specific needs (areas of strengths and weaknesses.) Further, schools are supported with district MTSS Staff Training Specialists and meet monthly to review student data, progress, and intervention materials. Additionally, schools follow the Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan and MTSS decision tree which indicates research based and evidence-based materials available for targeted interventions (Tier 2). If student data does not show progress at Tier 2 then adjustments will be made (teacher: student ration; time in intervention; intervention materials; instruction).

Person Responsible Deniece Moss (mossjd@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Evidence of a downward trend in discipline referrals. ↓25% since 19/20.

Average of 0.3 Referrals per school day
TOTAL REFERRALS: 57 19% of SBP
TOTAL STUDENTS: 29 students with referrals
Single Day with Most Referrals:
Friday October 16, 2020 3 Referrals (3 students)
Thursday November 05, 2020 3 Referrals (3 students)
Tuesday November 17, 2020 3 Referrals (2 students)

Top Infractions
Irbl: 30 (20 students)
Icld: 10 (5 students)
Ibat: 8 (5 students)
Icel: 2 (2 students)
Ifit: 2 (2 students)

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.

At West Bay Elementary we believe positive school culture and supportive relationships are the foundational elements of a fulfilling learning environment. Through the implementation of the schoolwide House System, our "Essential 15 Expectations," positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), Classroom Morning Meetings, teacher-to-student mentorships, and school counselor leadership lessons, we are engaging our scholars in ample opportunities to participate in positive and fulfilling social and emotional learning experiences and build community. At West Bay Elementary we place a strong emphasis on learning environments in which high levels of student engagement are promoted in order to deliver rigorous content and standards. Teachers and staff are encouraged to be creative and think outside the box when developing lessons and establishing their classroom environment. These expectations promote attendance and classroom participation schoolwide. In addition we provide our scholars with additional support to meet each individual's academic and behavioral needs through our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), Special Education, and English Language Learning Programs. The West Bay "Leadership Lessons" ensure that all scholars receive systematic lessons designed to provide them with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills appropriate for their developmental level. The monthly lessons build relational trust and cultivate a positive school climate at West Bay Elementary School.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our administration, teachers, support staff, scholars, and school families all have an understanding of the West Bay Essential Fifteen Expectations, and their critical role in the development of positive school culture and strong character in our scholars. The School House System Committee, administration, school counselor, and social and emotional learning coordinator collaborate to plan events promoting community building and school culture throughout the year. Through our House System, scholars and staff build vertical and horizontal relationships that extend beyond the classroom. Our school spirit days and house meetings encourage students, staff, and families to get excited about school and encourage community. In addition, the school counselor and social and emotional learning coordinator work as a team to develop morning meeting lessons focusing on the West Bay Essential 15 Expectations, House System Character Traits (Kindness, Empathy, Harmony, and Courage), and objectives from the Second Step SEL Program. The administration trusts the classroom teachers and support staff in the implementation of the schoolwide social and emotional learning through the daily morning meetings. During this time, the scholars learn about character traits and habits which will prepare them for a variety of social situations on campus and in life. Finally, our school counselor facilitates a positive school climate through her monthly leadership lessons with the scholars.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00