

Bay District Schools

Parker Elementary School



2021-22 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 | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Parker Elementary School

640 S HIGHWAY 22 A, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Chris Coan

Start Date for this Principal: 5/1/2017

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (49%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| ESSA Status | |

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay County School Board.

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 | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Parker Elementary School

640 S HIGHWAY 22 A, 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>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</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;">63%</p> |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay County School Board.

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.

Parker Elementary School (PES) seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success of all students through developmentally appropriate instruction that acknowledges individual differences and learning styles.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of all Parker Elementary School stakeholders is to meet the needs of all students by granting them diverse educational opportunities by means of:

- Instruction designed to prepare students for mastery of Florida State Standards.
- Learning that develops skills for students to improve in language arts, mathematics, and school safety.
- Opportunities to exhibit responsibilities and promote self-esteem.
- Teamwork to become productive citizens.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Coan, Christopher | Principal | Principal of the School. Overseeing all aspects of the school day. |
| Barron, Christen | Assistant Principal | To support the office of the principal in all aspects of the running of the school. |
| Turner, Ruth | Teacher, K-12 | Grade Chair, Leadership Team Representative (KDG) |
| Albin, Marie | Teacher, K-12 | Grade Chair, Leadership Team Representative (1st Grade) |
| Been, Cindy | Teacher, K-12 | Grade Chair, Leadership Team Representative (3rd Grade) |
| Beanland, Candice | Teacher, K-12 | Grade Chair, Leadership Team Representative (4th Grade) |
| Brooks, Aimee | Teacher, K-12 | Grade Chair, Leadership Team Representative (5th Grade) |
| Breland, Bill | Teacher, K-12 | Grade Chair, Leadership Team Representative (Special Area) |
| Henson, Teresa | Teacher, ESE | Grade Chair, Leadership Team Representative (ESE Department) |
| Hurst, BethAnn | Behavior Specialist | Leadership Team Representative (Behavior / Triad Team) Works with all behaviors campus wide. Writes and coordinates PBIP Plans |
| Hitzeman, Isabelle | School Counselor | Leadership Team Representative Oversees Testing ELL / 504 Accommodations (K-2) |
| Siler, Amber | School Counselor | Leadership Team Representative Testing, ELL, 504 Plans, COC referrals (3rd - 5th Grade students) |
| McGee, Marian | Other | Leadership Team Member School Based Academic Interventionist - Tier 3 Reading |
| Underwood, Debroah | Teacher, K-12 | Grade Chair, Leadership Team Representative (2nd Grade) |
| Swedlund, Elizabeth | Other | Leadership Team Member School Based Academic Interventionist - Tier 3 Reading |
| Sirmans, Tracey | Other | Leadership Team Member School Based Academic Interventionist - Tier 3 Reading |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 5/1/2017, Chris Coan

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

1

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

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

695

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

6

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

11

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 | 118 | 115 | 123 | 106 | 102 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 670 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 58 | 41 | 40 | 30 | 43 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 5 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| | 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 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 30 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |

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 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/7/2021

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 | 84 | 108 | 92 | 98 | 95 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 571 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 31 | 25 | 31 | 16 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

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 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | 84 | 108 | 92 | 98 | 95 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 571 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 31 | 25 | 31 | 16 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

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 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | | | | 43% | 55% | 57% | 46% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 54% | 59% | 58% | 62% | 49% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 63% | 57% | 53% | 53% | 45% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 36% | 56% | 63% | 43% | 57% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 48% | 54% | 62% | 58% | 57% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 33% | 42% | 51% | 61% | 46% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 49% | 53% | 53% | 54% | 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 | 38% | 61% | -23% | 58% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 58% | -25% | 58% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 56% | -9% | 56% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 62% | -32% | 62% | -32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 59% | -16% | 64% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -30% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 54% | -17% | 60% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -43% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 54% | -11% | 53% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA Map assessment given in Spring 2020

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 53 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 47 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 37 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 37 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 59 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 41 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 53 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 26 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 22 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 21 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 17 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 30 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 27 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 26 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 33 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 26 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 26 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 14 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 63 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 20 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 21 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 18 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 38 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 31 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 31 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 9 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 13 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 17 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 17 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 9 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 0 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 45 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 38 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 30 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 13 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 46 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 41 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 35 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 63 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | | | 47 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 36 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 25 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

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 | 11 | 25 | 30 | 11 | 5 | | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | | | 35 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 33 | | 15 | 7 | | 22 | | | | |
| HSP | 29 | 60 | | 21 | 10 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 37 | | | 37 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 29 | 33 | | 24 | 17 | | 38 | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 33 | 53 | 17 | 9 | 13 | 28 | | | | |
| 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 | 48 | | 15 | 21 | 23 | 30 | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 56 | | 34 | 37 | | 30 | | | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 52 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 45 | | 44 | 55 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 51 | 54 | 33 | 51 | 40 | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 53 | 63 | 35 | 47 | 35 | 45 | | | | |
| 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 | 26 | 48 | 44 | 25 | 49 | 59 | 45 | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 53 | | 31 | 50 | | 30 | | | | |
| HSP | 76 | 70 | | 71 | 70 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 61 | | | 44 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 61 | 55 | 42 | 56 | 62 | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 57 | 56 | 35 | 55 | 68 | 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 | 35 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 73 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 278 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 17 |
| 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 | 46 |
| 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 | 21 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 38 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 37 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 28 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 31 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?

Across the board in reading, math, and science proficiency rates have decreased amongst all subgroups.

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

The need for grade level appropriate materials and increased work on increased rigor combined with increased interventions for struggling students.

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

Parker Elementary and the Greater Bay District Schools have had several natural events that have dramatically impacted the school community. Category 5 Hurricane Michael devastated our area in October 2018. Combined with the 2020 and continuing COVID - 19 Pandemic affecting students consistency in a regular school day and year.

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

Increases in Math Instruction in particular grade levels.

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

Consistency with instruction and instructors.

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

Increase of staff to support Tier 3 Intervention (3 dedicated Academic Interventionist) and ESE Interventionist (4)

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.

Increased MTSS supports, increase supports with small group instruction.

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

MTSS Teams analyzing iReady data, diagnostic data, and common assessments to enhance learning.

Small group instruction being modeled for proper grouping of students and proper activities for students not with direct instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | This year we are implementing a new ELA Curriculum (HMH) and the supporting progress monitoring and intervention program (iReady). |
| Measurable Outcome: | The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs and regular attendance of PLC meeting to ensure proper implementation of the new programs are being implemented with fidelity. |
| Monitoring: | Attendance of PLC meetings (reviewing notes when not in attendance) giving specific feedback for questions regarding implementation of programs with high rigor and grade level appropriate activities. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Classroom Walk thru forms, directed feedback, using learning targets and standards to show appropriate instruction is being given to all students. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | On Going progress monitoring to ensure that students are receiving high level instruction every day. |

Action Steps to Implement

Classroom Walkthrus with targeted feedback -

Person Responsible Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

PLC notes reviewed and supported.

Person Responsible Marian McGee (mcgeemd@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2017 - 2018 SY (Before Hurricane Michael, and the Global Pandemic) Small group instruction was used in all classrooms and school data was at the highest.

Measurable Outcome: Increase school wide data to 2017-2018 school levels when small group instruction was used with fidelity.

Monitoring: Classroom Walk thru, PLC Notes will be reviewed, MTSS and Discipline Data Reviewed to ensure growth of all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Classroom walkthrus using learning targets and standards to ensure instruction is highly effective.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Highly effective instruction daily will help close academic gaps

Action Steps to Implement

Classroom Walkthrus

Person Responsible Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Analyze data (iReady) HMH diagnostic data

Person Responsible Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the current released data 41% of the third grade students tested scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 33% percent of third grade students tested scored a Level 2 on 2021 FSA ELA. This represents a total of 74% of third grade students that participated in FSA testing scored below the state’s criteria for proficiency.
 Based on the released data 44% of tested fourth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 22% of tested fourth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 66% of fourth graders that participated in FSA testing scored below the state’s criteria for proficiency.
 Based on the released data 33% of tested fifth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 34% of tested fifth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 67% of tested fifth grade students scored below the state’s criteria for proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: Students in grade 3 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 26% to 29%.
 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 34% to 37%.
 Students in grade 5 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 33% to 36%.

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: Christopher Coan (coancm@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 HMM 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- 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,

based Strategy: BDS teachers incorporate explicit, direct instruction (effect size of .60) and 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 training will guide teachers in the implementation of the curriculum. Teachers will meet in PLCs to analyze 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.

For any student who has not responded to a specific reading intervention delivered with fidelity and with the initial intensity provided, reading intervention instruction and/or materials may be changed based on student data. Diagnostic assessments will be required to identify specific needs. 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.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Our primary focus is to reduce the rate of Suspensions (OSS and ISS) from the 2020-2021 SY. Our behavior interventionist role with the role of our Mental Health Triad team has been restructured to meet the needs of our students in the classroom environment.

Our secondary concern is to ensure that the incidents of low or very low incidents remain low based on community supports for our families and 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.

This year Parker Elementary is implementing the Second Step Social and Emotional Lessons. This program combined with our Behavior Intervention Room (PROMISE) and our Positive Game Room will give our students the various supports (Tire 1 - 3) supports. Our behavior intention team will be working with students in the classroom, growing their small group social skills for behavior intervention. A point sheet related to specific behaviors to give an insight to the entire day.

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

Chris Coan - Principal

Christen Barron - Assistant Principal

We will support and implement the district behavior matrix while supporting and promoting the positive interactions between students and other students and staff and families.

Elizabeth Hurst - Behavior Interventionist

Lynisse MORning - Mental Health Triad

Cheryl Jones - Mental Health Triad

These individuals will push into classrooms to support students in Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 Behaviors. They will determine and implement the best intervention for the particular students needs.

ISabelle Hitzeman - School Based Counselor

Amber Siler - School Based Counselor

Supporting classroom instruction, implementing Leadership Clubs to increase student positive relationships.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--|---|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback | | | | \$495,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 150-Aides | 0211 - Parker Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 3.0 | \$495,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Purchasing Support staff and additional teaching units to lower class size and allow for small group instruction.</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | | | | \$0.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0211 - Parker Elementary School | General Fund | 57.5 | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Teachers and instructional staff for classroom instruction</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | | Total: | \$495,000.00 |