

Bay District Schools

Lucille Moore 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Lucille Moore Elementary School

1900 MICHIGAN AVE, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christina Bordelon

Start Date for this Principal: 4/14/2021

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 (49%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: D (34%)
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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Lucille Moore Elementary School

1900 MICHIGAN AVE, Panama City, FL 32405

[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	69%

School Grades History

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

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.

We will prepare all students for college and life by providing a challenging curriculum that is relevant to our students lives and their future in a safe, supportive, and nurturing environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to make a positive difference.

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
Bordelon, Christina	Principal	Christina Bordelon-Principal: Oversees and evaluates all functions of the school. Mrs. Weatherly evaluates teacher and paraprofessional performance through the teacher appraisal system, classroom walk-throughs, 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 Lucille Moore Elementary School.
Harrington, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Jennifer Harrington- Administrative Assistant: Supports Mrs. Bordelon in her administrative role. She aides in the evaluation of teacher and paraprofessional performance, data analysis, etc. She helps to provide teachers with what resources they need to implement effective instruction in the classroom. She meets regularly with teachers to discuss student data and teacher performance data. She works with the Behavior Interventionist and Social Worker to implement effective discipline procedures and strategies with at-risk students.
Davis, Kevin	Other	Kevin Davis- Title I Coordinator: Kevin oversees activities, mandates, budget, requirements, etc connected to Title I. He provides teachers and staff with the resources, tools and information they need to carry out effective instruction. He works with Guidance and Instructional district personnel in providing resources/strategies to students in special programs such as MTSS, Behavior MTSS, students in crisis, low attendance, etc. He also oversees the Parent Involvement Plan and implementation of the plan and activities at Lucille Moore Elementary.
Frigon, Tracy	Instructional Media	Tracy Frigon- Instructional Media and Technology: Tracy participates in all leadership meetings. She provides much needed support and resources to all teachers and staff in the area of media and technology. She provides training to teachers in various areas related to technology and student achievement.
Gaddy, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Intervention Teacher
Pickrell, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	eachers 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.
Rushing, Ronada	Assistant Principal	Supports Mrs. Bordelon in her administrative role. She aides in the evaluation of teacher and paraprofessional performance, data analysis, etc. She helps to provide teachers with what resources they need to implement effective instruction in the classroom. She meets regularly with teachers to

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		discuss student data and teacher performance data. She works with the Behavior Interventionist and Social Worker to implement effective discipline procedures and strategies with at-risk students.
Carl, Diane	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor actively participate on the School Leadership Team. They give much needed input and shared decision-making from a classroom guidance counselor's perspective. They also provide leadership to the PLCs and resources to all teachers and students throughout the school.
Price, Kellie	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Chair
Siegal, Miriam	Teacher, K-12	Fourth grade Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 4/14/2021, Christina Bordelon

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.*

3

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

468

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

8

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

5

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	70	85	67	72	75	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	29	35	29	28	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	6	1	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	4	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	33	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	44	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	13	7	8	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	3	6	4	4	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

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	68	73	68	62	67	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	402
Attendance below 90 percent	8	17	12	10	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	7	6	12	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	68	73	68	62	67	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	402
Attendance below 90 percent	8	17	12	10	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	7	6	12	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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				38%	55%	57%	27%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	59%	58%	38%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	57%	53%	43%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				41%	56%	63%	31%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	54%	62%	41%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	42%	51%	46%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				37%	53%	53%	24%	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	39%	61%	-22%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	58%	-14%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	30%	56%	-26%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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	46%	59%	-13%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	23%	54%	-31%	60%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	53%	-11%
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)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	x	x	45/95 47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	35/78 45%
	Students With Disabilities			8/18 44%
	English Language Learners			7/22 32%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	x	x	44/95 46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	36/78 46%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	7/18 39%
	English Language Learners	x	x	9/22 41%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	x	x	17/84 20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	10/60 17%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	1/21 5%
	English Language Learners	x	x	0/18 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	x	x	31/84 37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	21/60 35%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	4/21 19%
	English Language Learners	x	x	3/18 17%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	x	x	37/90 41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	28/70 40%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	4/13 31%
	English Language Learners	x	x	2/24 8%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	x	x	36/90 40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	27/70 39%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	5/13 38%
	English Language Learners	x	x	3/25 12%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	x	x	27/92 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	19/73 26%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	5/25 20%
	English Language Learners	x	x	7/21 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	x	x	13/94 14%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	8/73 11%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	1/25 4%
	English Language Learners	x	x	1/13 8%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	28/76 37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	21/61 34%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	1/23 4%
	English Language Learners	x	x	3/19 16%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	26/76 34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	24/62 39%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	2/23 9%
	English Language Learners	x	x	5/18 28%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	25/76 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	23/62 37%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	4/22 18%
	English Language Learners	x	x	3/19 16%

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	31	35		28	18		45				
ELL	29	70		18	40						
BLK	35	31		22			45				
HSP	40	67		24	33		29				
MUL	31			38							
WHT	35	30		35	30		71				
FRL	37	48	70	29	22		48				
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	29	49	56	35	47	47	14				
ELL	19	57		35	48						
BLK	40	56	69	37	49	64	38				

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	25	58		36	48		30				
MUL	33			55							
WHT	48	59		43	63		44				
FRL	37	57	61	42	54	58	39				
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	19	24	25	25	33	27	7				
ELL	23	56	53	26	54		30				
BLK	20	33		19	21		9				
HSP	32	50	50	37	55	60	33				
MUL	25	36		27							
WHT	28	27		37	41		17				
FRL	26	38	46	28	41	43	21				

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	27
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	43
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	35
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	40
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	45
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?

The school-wide trend that emerged across all grade levels was that less than 50% of our students attained proficiency in all subject areas. This same trend was true for our subgroups with less than 50% meeting proficiency in all subject areas.

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

Based on our Progress Monitoring Data from the 20-21 school year our ELL population showed the least amount of progress toward proficiency. The spring MAP data demonstrates that 0/18 ELL second graders showed proficiency, 2/24 3rd ELL students showed proficiency, and 3/19 5th graders showed proficiency.

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

Many of our ELL students chose to be educated through our virtual instruction. This proved challenging to many of them as there was often issues with accessing the digital components of instruction. As a result, many of these students missed critical instruction for the first semester.

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

Our Progress Monitoring Data shows that there was little difference in the percent of proficiency when comparing our students identified as Economically Disadvantaged with the general population. In most cases there were on or two percentage points separating the two. We also saw that our Students with Disabilities in the first grade performed at the same level of proficiency as their grade level counterparts.

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

We were fortunate at Lucille Moore to use additional funding to support our tested grade levels by ensuring smaller class size. We also hope that implementing Imagine Learning with fidelity will help our ELL students. This program will provide targeted intervention and instruction at the students' level to address learning deficits. We believe that in addition to small group, differentiated instruction, this individualized skill based practice through iReady will provide remediation for our lowest performing students.

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

Bay County had adopted a new ELA , 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.

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.

Our district has provided on-going virtual trainings to support teachers in the implementation of the new curriculum. In addition, there are ELA Liaisons that receive in-depth training on the curriculum and all of the components including formative and summative assessments. The school's liaison will provide on campus support and training to all teachers.

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

In addition to the adoption of the new curriculum, our district has implemented a new Progress Monitoring program called iReady. This program will provide diagnostic data for all students K-8 three times per school year. This data will help drive instruction and will ensure that students in need are receiving the necessary interventions. In addition to the diagnostic tool, this program offers individualized instruction to address deficit areas. All students grades K-5 will have access to these individualized lessons that can offer both remediation and acceleration based on the students' needs. In grades 6-8 students that are in the Intensive Reading Course will also have access to the these individualized remediation lessons. In addition, our students identified ESE will have access to these lessons as well. iReady includes periodic "growth measures" so that progress can be more closely monitored for our students in need.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. 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 49% of the third grade students tested scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 32% percent of third grade students tested scored a Level 2 on 2021 FSA ELA. This represents a total of 81% of third grade students that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.

Based on the released data 43% of tested fourth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 24% of tested fourth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 67% of fourth graders that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.

Based on the released data 36% of tested fifth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 37% of tested fifth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 72% 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 19% to 21%.

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 33% to 36%.

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 28% to 31%.

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:

[no one identified]

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) 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 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.

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.

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 ratio; time in intervention; intervention materials; instruction).

Person Responsible Christina Bordelon (bordecl@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	Based on a review of our discipline data, we see that 434 Discipline Referrals were written during the 20-21 school year. Of those DRs 179 of those were written for physical attack. This is the area that we plan to focus on for the 21-22 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like to see a 10% reduction of our Discipline Referrals for physical attack this school year.
Monitoring:	We are fortunate to have a site based interventionist focused only on student behavior. Our interventionist closely tracks the behavior of our students and the implementation and fidelity of behavior interventions. Our PLCs include behavior interventions as a part of their weekly data discussions and the teams also participate in our monthly data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Bordelon (bordecl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We have adopted a schoolwide implementation of Core Essentials Character Education. We teach our students essential skills through our morning announcements, visuals, lessons and videos. Additionally we have worked to create Trauma Sensitive Classrooms with each classroom incorporating a "calm down corner" to assist students in recognizing their feeling and their need for a break.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students have experienced a great deal of trauma first with experiencing a Cat 5 Hurricane and currently with COVID. These are compounded with the daily trauma that many of our student experience due to domestic and family experiences. Our school Triad Team and outside trauma training continues to be essential in helping our staff to better serve and empathize with our students.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher will receive trauma training and the proper use of their Calm Down Corner.
Core Essentials Character Education will continue

Person Responsible Christina Bordelon (bordecl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Behavior data will continue to be tracked and interventions will be put into place and monitored as necessary.

Person Responsible Kevin Davis (daviskb@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus	Lucille Moore will increase student proficiency in reading and math, by using appropriate data to identify specific needs in order to plan and provide accelerated intervention, instruction, and enrichment.
Description and Rationale:	Focusing on accelerated intervention, instruction and enrichment based on students' needs will increase the number of students who achieve learning gains. Increasing the students making learning gains will therefore increase our number of student that will be proficient in ELA and math.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>The number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in ELA will increase from 69% to 72%.</p> <p>The number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gain in math will increase from 17% to 25%.</p> <p>The number of student making learning gains overall in ELA will increase from 47% to 51%.</p> <p>The number of students making learning gains overall in math will increase from 23% to 27%.</p>
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring data available through our iReady Diagnostics along with Growth Monitoring Assessments will be carefully monitored. Additionally, student performance on common summative and formative assessments will be the focus of weekly data reviews in our PLCs and monthly data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through the utilization of effective grade level PLCS, teachers and instructional coaches will collaborate to plan and prepare for effective instruction and intervention based of students' needs. 2. Collaboration and Professional Development with TNTP provides teachers the support and guidance needs to understand student data and base instruction and intervention on the needs of the students. 3. Simplified MTSS/RTI at Work will be implemented, allowing us to strengthen and support the school's academic program through strategic focus. 4. Data Chat meetings (to include MTSS Interventionist- School and District Level, School of Hope Team Members) and administration discuss the needs of the students have develop a plan to address the needs. 5. Dedicated Intervention/Enrichment Time
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher meet at least once as week to prepare and plan for standards based instruction. They will review student data and discuss the implementation of effective instruction and invention strategies based on the needs of students as demonstrated on the data shared. 2. The collaboration with TNTP will ensure that instruction meets the intended rigor of the standards and intervention is based on the academic needs of the students. 3. Monthly Data chat meetings with all teachers in grade level PLCs, instructional coaches, support team members (to include MTSS Interventionist- School and District Level, School of Hope Team Members) and administration will discuss the needs of the students and develop a plan to address the needs. 4. Intervention Fidelity, Fluidity, Accountability, Monitoring. Within the master schedule, students have a specific Math as well AS ELA time for providing intervention and enrichment to all students at Lucille Moore.
Action Steps to Implement	

Through the utilization of effective grade level PLCS, teachers and instructional coaches will collaborate to plan and prepare for effective instruction and intervention based of students' needs. Teacher will meet at least once as week to prepare and plan for standards based instruction. Collaboration will continue as they review student data and discuss the implementation of effective instruction and invention strategies based on the needs of students as demonstrated on the data.

Person Responsible Christina Bordelon (bordecl@bay.k12.fl.us)

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.

Based on the 19-20 data posted on the SafeSchoolsforAlex the data has ranked Lucille Moore "Very High" for Suspensions with a total of 114 suspensions. A majority of those suspensions were In-School Suspensions while 22 of those were Out of School Suspensions. Suspensions continue to be an area that we monitor. Our "Violent Incidents" are also considered to be "High." This is an area that our school continues to be focused and included as a goal on our School Improvement Plan.

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.

Lucille Moore Elementary strives to provide a culture of acceptance and infinite possibility. Not only to we make every effort to meet the academic success of our students, we do our best to ensure students and families have the tools and necessities to address their basic needs.

We are able to accomplish a positive school culture and environment by consulting with various stakeholders. Working in partnership with educational institutions, businesses, local governments, school board members, volunteers, mentors, and social services we are able to offer our teachers, students and families additional resources that they need to be successful!

- Inviting school board members to participate in back to school events opens the door for those members to understand the dynamics of the school therefore lending itself to make better informed decisions.

- Collaboration with Panama City City Council on a partnership with students and the city to educate students on city government and expose students to live sessions of the government in action.

- Elevate Bay mentors invest, support, and partner with several students and classrooms to encourage and motivate students to maximize their potential.
- Various Church partnerships- campus beautification, donations of food, clothes and shoe.
- Gulf Coast College partnership to expose students to different forms of music and educate elementary students with music opportunities in college.
- FSU partnership math event to assist in creating a culture where students love math.
- Oceaneering partnership to educate and expose students to different career fields and job opportunities in Panama City.
- Inviting Social Services to school events allows them to offers additional student and family educational opportunities and supplemental resources for families.

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

The stakeholders are teachers, staff, students, and community members. It is very important to us as a school to promote and model positive, appropriate behavior with our students and staff. Our students follow the schoolwide expectations. We recite the "Patriot Pledge" every morning on announcements, and each classroom has schoolwide expectations and classroom expectations displayed in their classroom. We communicate our schoolwide expectations with our stakeholders outside of school as well because it is important for them to be privy to our expectations and intent for promoting positive behavior.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00