Bay District Schools

Callaway Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Callaway Elementary School

7115 E HIGHWAY 22, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Good   Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2019

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: D (40%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
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.](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

Callaway Elementary School

7115 E HIGHWAY 22, Panama City, FL 32404

[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 PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

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

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.

Callaway Elementary School is dedicated to developing a nurturing community that fosters academic excellence, skills, and character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Callaway Elementary School will be a district and state leader in education and every student will be successful.

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
Phillips, Dra	Principal	The School Leadership Team met in the summer as part of a continuous cycle of reviewing data and updating our School Improvement Plan. As a team, we reviewed and will continue to review various data sources to conduct a need's assessment to determine the best direction for our school in the School Improvement process. All members listed above participated in this shared decision-making process. Together we determined our vision and focus for the upcoming school year. Each member has an equal stake in the school leadership team. Andra Philips- Principal: Oversees and evaluates all functions of the school. She evaluates teacher and paraprofessional performance through the teacher appraisal system, classroom walkthroughs, data chats, assessment data, etc. She sits on various committees to give guidance and input (ie MTSS). She leads and guides the school leadership team and the implementation of effective PLCs. She makes sure that teachers have the resources they need to implement curriculum, assessment and instruction effectively. She is the main connection between district initiatives and implementation of those initiatives at Callaway.
Monette, Ken	Assistant Principal	Kenneth Monette - Administrative Assistant: Mr. Monette supports Mrs. Phillips in her administrative role. He aides in the evaluation of teachers and paraprofessional performancse, data analysis, etc. He helps to provide teachers with what resources they need to implement effective instruction in the classroom. He meets regularly with teachers to discuss student data and teacher performance data. He works with the Behavior Interventionist and Social Worker to implement effective discipline procedures and strategies with at-risk students.
Rogers, Jo	School Counselor	Jo Rogers - Guidance Counselor: The guidance counselors work with all parties involved with the students. They counsel students as needed, provide classroom character education lessons, facilitate child study team meetings and MTSS data chats, prepare and conduct district and state assessments, and work with outside agencies to help meet the need of our students. She works with Guidance and Instructional district personnel in providing resources/strategies to students in special programs such as MTSS, Behavior MTSS, students in crisis and low attendance, etc.
Combs, Renee	Teacher, ESE	Julie Koss, Cynthia Williams, Amy Carter, Renee Combs, Laura Murrell, Shante Holmes, and Michael Dunnivant- Teachers K-12: Teachers actively participate on the School Leadership Team. They give much-needed input and shared decision-making from a classroom teacher's perspective. They also provide leadership to the PLCs and resources to all teachers throughout the school.
Williams, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Julie Koss, Cynthia Williams, Amy Carter, Renee Combs, Laura Murrell, Shante Holmes, and Michael Dunnivant- Teachers K-12: Teachers actively participate on the School Leadership Team. They give much-needed input and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		shared decision-making from a classroom teacher's perspective. They also provide leadership to the PLCs and resources to all teachers throughout the school.
Koss, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Julie Koss, Cynthia Williams, Amy Carter, Renee Combs, Laura Murrell, Shante Holmes, and Michael Dunnivant- Teachers K-12: Teachers actively participate on the School Leadership Team. They give much-needed input and shared decision-making from a classroom teacher's perspective. They also provide leadership to the PLCs and resources to all teachers throughout the school.
Dunnivant, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Julie Koss, Cynthia Williams, Amy Carter, Renee Combs, Laura Murrell, Shante Holmes, and Michael Dunnivant- Teachers K-12: Teachers actively participate on the School Leadership Team. They give much-needed input and shared decision-making from a classroom teacher's perspective. They also provide leadership to the PLCs and resources to all teachers throughout the school.
	Teacher, K-12	Julie Koss, Cynthia Williams, Amy Carter, Renee Combs, Laura Murrell, Shante Holmes, and Michael Dunnivant- Teachers K-12: Teachers actively participate on the School Leadership Team. They give much-needed input and shared decision-making from a classroom teacher's perspective. They also provide leadership to the PLCs and resources to all teachers throughout the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/1/2019, Michelle Good

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

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

439

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

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
10

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	67	73	92	76	61	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436
Attendance below 90 percent	23	26	20	16	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	28	16	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	2	5	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	1	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	62	72	54	56	50	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
Attendance below 90 percent	14	25	10	7	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	9	5	4	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
	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	2	1	1	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	62	72	54	56	50	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
Attendance below 90 percent	14	25	10	7	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	9	5	4	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
	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	2	1	1	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				36%	55%	57%	41%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				40%	59%	58%	41%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	57%	53%	40%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				42%	56%	63%	48%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				45%	54%	62%	53%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	42%	51%	38%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				39%	53%	53%	50%	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	46%	61%	-15%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	37%	58%	-21%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	30%	56%	-26%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	62%	-9%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	59%	-16%	64%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	53%	-14%
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 Measures of Academic Performance (MAP) - grades kindergarten through grade 5

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79	86	92 45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/63 (35%)	20/70 - 29%	28/74-38%
	Students With Disabilities	8/24 (33%)	7/19 - 37%	6/26 - 23%
	English Language Learners	3/7 (43%)	2/6 - 33%	2/7- 29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79	75	92
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/63 (51%)	26/70 - 37%	29/74 - 39%
	Students With Disabilities	9/24 (38%)	7/19 -37%	7/26 - 27%
	English Language Learners	3/7 (43%)	2/6 - 33%	2/7 - 29%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	75	60 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/53 (69%)	25/56 - 45%	30/30 - 50%
	Students With Disabilities	5/15 (33%)	6/16 - 38%	5/15 - 33%
	English Language Learners	4/7 (57%)	2/8 - 25%	6/8 - 75%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	75	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/53 (38%)	18/56 - 32%	29/60 - 48%
	Students With Disabilities	5/15 (33%)	4/16 - 25%	4/15 - 27%
	English Language Learners	2/7 (29%)	1/8 - 13%	2/8 - 25%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	68	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	%	19/50 - 38%	19/46 - 41%
	Students With Disabilities	%	4/20 - 20%	5/19 - 26%
	English Language Learners	%	0/6 - 0%	1/6 - 17%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67	68	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/49 - 53%	15/50 - 30%	21/46 - 46%
	Students With Disabilities	5/18 - 28%	2/20 - 10%	4/19 - 21%
	English Language Learners	1/6-17%	1/6 - 17%	2/6 - 33%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59	66	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/47 - 49%	21/53 - 40%	26/52 - 50%
	Students With Disabilities	1/15 - 7%	1/15 - 12%	4/16 - 25%
	English Language Learners	2/3-67%	1/4 - 25%	2/4 - 50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59	66	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/47 - 45%	21/53 - 40%	24/52 - 46%
	Students With Disabilities	1/15 - 7%	1/17 - 6%	3/16 - 19%
	English Language Learners	2/3 - 67%	1/4 - 25%	1/4 - 25%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	68	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/41 - 51%	14/46 - 30%	17/39 - 44%
	Students With Disabilities	4/13 - 31%	6/13 - 46%	7/13 - 54%
	English Language Learners	3/7 - 43%	2/6 - 0%	1/8 - 13%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	68	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/41 - 34%	12/46 - 30%	17/39 - 44%
	Students With Disabilities	3/13 - 23%	3/13 - 23%	6/13 - 46%
	English Language Learners	2/7 - 29%	1/6 - 17%	2/8 - 25%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68	68	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/41 - 54%	27/46 - 59%	25/42 - 63%
	Students With Disabilities	4/13 - 31%	5/13 - 38%	6/11 - 55%
	English Language Learners	3/7- 43%	2/6 - 33%	4/7 - 57%

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	17	25		22	25						
ELL	31			23							
BLK	28	38		32	23		20				
HSP	35			31							
MUL	25			46							
WHT	55	55		42	32		38				
FRL	42	43	36	37	30	40	29				

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	20	36	50	23	52	54					
ELL	30			50							
BLK	18	33		23	25						
HSP	50			43							
MUL	41	46		59	38						
WHT	39	39	33	48	51	31	48				
FRL	33	39	39	41	43	43	30				

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	18	29	36	27	29	29					
BLK	30	45	44	34	36	33	44				
HSP	48	38		67	69						
MUL	54	46		56	58						
WHT	40	36	36	49	57	44	48				
FRL	38	40	41	45	53	36	49				

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	28
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	41
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	36
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	44
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	38
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?

Based upon the data available our students with disabilities from grades K to 2 are struggling in English Language Arts and Math. In grades 3 through 5, ELL learners are struggling to obtain the same level of growth as their peers in both language arts and math. Our greatest areas of need based on the 2019 Progress Monitoring data is our ESE and our ELL population. We see that our ELL students demonstrated very little growth when comparing their PMD from Fall to Winter. This is especially true in the first grade where the percentage of proficiency dropped from 43% (3/7) to 29% (2/7) and in the third grade where only one ELL student showed proficiency by the end of the school year. This limited growth was also evident for our ESE students in the first grade. We saw a decline in the percentage of proficiency from 33% (8/24) to 23% (6/26).

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

Based on the 2021 Progress Monitoring data, our greatest areas of need are our ESE and ELL population in first and third grades. In addition, online learning and the pandemic may have contributed to the ongoing decline of Black/African American students during the 2020/21 school year. The online component appeared to be a challenge for the students as well as the staff members. PLCs suffered because they were unable to collaborate effectively virtually. The morale and exchange of practices among staff decreased.

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

Specific factors that contribute to the decline in academics include the issues related to BayLink our innovative approach to online learning in response to the pandemic contributed to the ongoing decline

of Black/African American, ELL, and ESE students during the 2020/21 school year. The online component appeared to be a challenge for the students as well as the staff members. For the 2021 - 2022 school year, BayLink has been eliminated and all students are participating in Brick and Mortar instruction. Additionally, a reflective analysis of the data indicates there may be a need for staff members to be trained on the utilization of instructional practices that are tailored to the unique composition of each class based on student identity. We are collaborating with the district to provide customized professional development for teachers and administrators at Callaway Elementary School. In an effort to support student success through positive role models from similar identities, we have sought highly-qualified application candidates from diverse ethnicities and genders. We have been successful in increasing the varied demographics of school personnel.

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

According to the progress monitoring Science was the area that showed the greatest improvement.

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

New staff members that were highly motivated to teach science and integrate science into all subject areas to all students. Hands on projects/experiments were highly encourage and included on a frequent basis.

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

Strategies to accelerate learning based upon the trends found though our data include prioritizing standards, guided reading, scaffolding, building knowledge and vocabulary, diagnosing missed learning, and collaborative teams.

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.

Professional development on the Daily 5 by Gail Boushey and Joan Moser and the Fundamental 5 by Sean Cain and Mike Laird will be ongoing. Student engagement tips/handouts in the weekly newsletters.

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

Small group instruction, administration participation in PLC, monthly data chats, school and district walk-throughs, constructive feedback and continuous professional development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Progress Monitoring Data available for the 20-21 school year, 45% of our first-grade students demonstrated proficiency on the Reading Measure of Academic Progress at the end of the school year. Additionally, 24% of our second graders showed proficiency on the MAP Reading Spring Assessment. The Students with disabilities showed limited growth according to the PMD. The level of proficiency fell from 33% in the Fall to 23% in the Spring for our First graders and remained at 33% from Fall to Spring with our second graders.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on the Progress Monitoring Data from iReady we will increase the percentage of proficiency in Reading for first grade from 45% Proficient to 55% Proficient. Second-grade students will see an increase of proficiency from 24% to 34% proficient.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, monthly data chats, and review of student growth using the iReady program as well as classroom grades.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dra Phillips (phillat@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The implementation of the new Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Into Reading core curriculum includes lessons rooted in the BEST Standards and includes engaging strategies such as gradual release, the small group targeted instruction using grade-level materials, writer's workshops, and independent practice. The program includes tabletop lessons to guide small group instruction to ensure that grade level instruction is accessible to all learners. 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) and scaffolding (effect size of. 82) based on Hattie's research (Visible Learning: John Hattie 2017)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will work with a PLCs to improve effectiveness of grade level instruction.The collaboration between teachers and interventionist will provide teachers with a skill set to ensure effective instruction and interventions based of students' needs. Teachers will meet at least twice a week as a grade level team to prepare and plan for standards based instruction. Collaboration will continue with review of student data and discuss changes needed in instructional practices to improve student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

a) Data collected and reviewed will be iReady, FSA, Classroom Walk-through, Common Task, MTSS.
b) When and how often data will be collected and reviewed
• iReady (3 Times per year)
• Classroom walk-though data - weekly or as it occurs
• Monthly Data Chats with teachers and Admin
• FSA (Annually)
c) We will monitor effectiveness through teacher and student data chats after the iReady administration and through MTSS meetings. Student conferences will be held to inform students of their standing and make maximum growth. Changes will be made as needed based on data identified through our MTSS meetings and ensure the intervention utilized is effective based on the students' academic performance. If academic progress is not occurring plans will be put in place to modify interventions as needed.
d) An intervention teacher will be hired to assist with the ESE subgroup that has made marginal growth.

Person Responsible	Dra Phillips (phillat@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	CES will have fully active and functioning PLCs that include participation, attendance, and support by the assigned administrator. Active participation in the PLC process will lead to more rigorous Instruction meeting the needs of all subgroups. Through close analysis of the data from our formative and summative assessments, we will be able to better meet the needs of all learners. This will result in increased learning gains for all. As data indicates, CES is a D school with many subgroups being under the desired 50%. We will focus on rigorous instruction to increase every category relating to proficiency and learning gains. Additionally, we will integrate the acceleration into our practice.
Measurable Outcome:	Callaway Elementary School will move from a D(40%) to a C (41-53%) by the end of the 2021-2022 academic school year.
Monitoring:	The outcome for the PLC process will be monitored through the participation of administration in the meetings as well as an overview of the PLC weekly notes and final outcome after the strategies/interventions have been put into place.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dra Phillips (phillat@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional learning communities have been at the forefront of transforming schools to improve student achievement. Effective PLCs are founded on the shared vision and values of improving learning outcomes for all students. When staff has ongoing, consistent meeting times for PLCs such that they are able to respond to students' needs in a timely manner, those responses are shown to have a greater impact in ensuring all students have equitable opportunities to learn and grow academically.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that when the focus is on the necessary components PLCs are effective All of the components must be implemented together for the maximum effectiveness to be shown. Components include: 1. Focus on advancing student learning. 2. Meet and collaborate on a regular basis. 3. Promote a spirit of collaboration, inquiry, and reflection within PLCs. 4. Analyze student work and student data. 5. Intentionally support PLC meetings. *Provide school-wide guidance on how to effectively facilitate a PLC. *Monitor the effectiveness of each PLC.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Grade Chairs will be appointed and trained in the PLC Agenda with a guide focus on increasing student learning gains.
2. PLC Meetings will be scheduled on the faculty calendar on the same day each week for consistency
3. PLCs will meet weekly and administration and grade chairs will work together to refine the process through feedback
4. To increase student outcomes, student results will be frequently reviewed and analyzed. This will include the PLCs overview of their own effectiveness based on the results and making changes to their practices based upon the students gains (or lack of).
5. PLCs must provide meeting minutes, planning documents, data analysis, or other evidence of their work to determine that each group is focused on the priorities and expectations.

Person Responsible	Dra Phillips (phillat@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3. 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 current released data 39% of the third grade students tested scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 18% percent of third grade students tested scored a Level 2 on 2021 FSA ELA. This represents a total of 77% of third grade students that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency. Based on the released data 38% of tested fourth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 23% of tested fourth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 61% of fourth graders that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency. Based on the released data 39% of tested fifth-grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally, 25% of tested fifth-graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 64% 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 43% to 46%. 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 39% to 42%. 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 36% to 39%.
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:	Dra Phillips (phillat@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 Dra Phillips (phillat@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 Dra Phillips (phillat@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 Dra Phillips (phillat@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.

According to the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org Callaway Elementary is in the very high category for suspensions. Our students have experienced two major negative events in the past two and a half years. To address this issue, all teachers will receive training in de-escalation techniques in order to lower the number of incidents that often lead to office managed referrals. In addition our school will participate in the kindness.org initiative. We will continue Restorative Practices as well as lowering the classroom sizes to providing more teacher and para support per pupil. All teachers will be required to have calming areas in their classroom to provide students a safe, no punitive, space to refocus.

We will monitor the environment through the lens of PBIS and build in more positive rewards for interacting with peers in a positive manner. Meetings will be held monthly and TRIAD team members will provide Social Skills small group sessions for students who have three or more incidents with peers.

In the past we have had students that have enrolled at Callaway coming from other schools within the district that had high numbers of referrals. Unfortunately, their referrals transferred with the students. As an example, two students (grade 1 and 3) came to our school with a total of 24 referrals. Once here we had no visible issues with the students. With the added supports included at Callaway both students were able to maintain their behavior without any further incidents.

We will continue to work on improving our overall school environment for student

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.

Callaway is proud to have strong relationships with parents, business partners, churches and government entities. The school and community has embraced technology in an effort to stay connected and maintain our relationship.

The continued communication has allowed us to keep our stakeholders knowledgeable about our efforts to make Callaway a fun, loving school with high expectations for learning. Conferences, workshops and

academic events are scheduled at times that will enable our stakeholders to have a more involved effort (i.e. an hour before dismissal). Communication stays open through our courteous office staff, up to date Facebook page, and Everbridge alerts to notify and remind parents of important events, opportunities and attendance. Teachers continue to keep Parent Portal up to date with student progress and teacher comments as well as the real time communication through DOJO.

We continue to work with our parents to enhance the education of our students and problem solve areas of need manifest. We work with the district and outside agencies to address the needs of our families. needs and build a stronger foundation for our school and community. It takes a whole community to build a strong population and allow positive growth for the future and we are counting on stakeholders working collaboratively to help us reach our goal.

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

Andra Phillips - Principal
Kenneth Monette - Administrative Assistant
Jo Rogers - School Counselor
PBIS team: Renee Combs, Amy Carter, Carrie Stevens, Denise Brown
School Leadership Team: Renee Combs, Michael Dunnivant, Laura Murrell, Cynthia Williams, Shante Holmes, Paul Levingston.
Mental Health Triad members
Callaway also works with many community, church, business and government partners throughout the year to help build a strong support system for all stakeholders.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards				$158,179.67
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG	0.88	$50,355.00
		Notes: (Object 121) 1st grade teacher to lower class size. This is a grade level with significant needs. 7.5 hrs a day @ $39.15 an hour.				
	5100	150-Aides	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG	1.71	$24,419.00
		Notes: (Object 151) Continue to employee 2 paras to assist with core instruction and provide supports in K-3 classrooms. 5.75 hrs a day for 163 days @ 13.87 an hour.				
	5100	210-Retirement	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$11,858.00
		Notes: For intervention teacher and paras				
	5100	220-Social Security	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,722.00
		Notes: For intervention teacher, paras, substitutes				
	5100	230-Group Insurance	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,638.00
		Notes: For intervention teacher and paras				

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,137.00
			Notes: For intervention teacher, paras, and substitutes			
	5100	510-Supplies	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,479.00
			Notes: Address writing skills with 75 - 4th grade students - HMH Know it, Show it; and Writers Notebook $18.45 each + $276 shipping $3,044 and 10 Spanish $19.75 + $40 shipping. Total $3,479			
	6200	612-Library Books for Existing Libraries	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$9,117.67
			Notes: Purchase graphic novels, assorted fiction and non-fiction books, ELL books, and STEM related books for the students to check out from the media center. Approx. 760 books at $12 each.			
	6300	150-Aides	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG	1.71	$29,595.00
			Notes: (Object 151) Continue to pay 2 paras - one 5.75 hour para and one 7 hour para to push into K-1 classrooms to provide students with behavior supports to keep students from having to leave the classroom and provide check in and check out behavior supports. 163 days @ $14.24 per hr			
	6300	210-Retirement	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,204.00
			Notes: For behavior support paras			
	6300	220-Social Security	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$2,265.00
			Notes: For behavior support paras			
	6300	230-Group Insurance	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,931.00
			Notes: For behavior support paras			
	6300	240-Workers Compensation	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$445.00
			Notes: For behavior support paras			
	5100	750-Other Personal Services	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,014.00
			Notes: Substitutes for 1st grade teacher when she on sick or personal leave to continue instruction. $84.5 per day for 12 days.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities**				**$22,872.50**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG	0.44	$19,041.00
			Notes: Hire a part time literacy coach to begin Sept 1, 2021 to work 3.75 hrs a day to the end of the school year to analyze data with K-3 teachers in their PLC's and model in classrooms. $29.61 per hour.			
	6400	210-Retirement	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$2,061.00
			Notes: For the literacy coach			
	6400	220-Social Security	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,457.00

			Notes: For the literacy coach			
	6400	230-Group Insurance	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$27.50
			Notes: For the literacy coach			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	0101 - Callaway Elementary School	UniSIG		$286.00
			Notes: For the literacy coach			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$185,915.00**