Waller Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Waller Elementary School

11332 E HIGHWAY 388, Youngstown, FL 32466

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gina Mcnally

Start Date for this Principal: 8/17/2021

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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (51%)
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

Waller Elementary School

11332 E HIGHWAY 388, Youngstown, FL 32466

[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	12%

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.

Mission Statement: Waller is a B.E.E. school by Bringing Enlightenment through Empowerment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision of Waller Elementary:

To ensure students have a positive learning environment by creating a culture of kindness that fosters a community of lifelong learners.

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
Bigsby, Angela	Teacher, K-12	Grade chair, PLC team lead, Leadership Team lead, ELA Liaison for Grade 5.
McNally, Gina	Principal	School Instructional Leader
Crowley, T.J.	Teacher, K-12	Grade levele chair, Leadership Team lead, Math Liaison.
Hood, Angela	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Chair, PLC Team Lead.
Thedford, Carla	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Chair, PLC Team Lead.
Davis, Josephine	Assistant Principal	Student discipline, Instrcutional Leadership.
Ferguson, Patrick	Teacher, K-12	Music Teacher SIP Team Member
Register, Mary-Margaret	School Counselor	Student wellness and testing coordinator
Mertes, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Interventionis and Title I Coordinator
Emfinger, Patricia	Other	Behavior Paraprofessional
Wester , Carla	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Chair and PLC Team Lead
Gunter, Alicia	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Grade Chair and PLC Team Lead
Odom, Karla	Teacher, K-12	School Improvement Team member

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/17/2021, Gina Mcnally

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

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

361

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

1

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

1

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	66	58	62	65	51	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	352
Attendance below 90 percent	12	18	13	23	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	6	5	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/17/2021

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	50	60	65	59	59	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Attendance below 90 percent	5	15	14	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	50	60	65	59	59	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Attendance below 90 percent	5	15	14	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				42%	55%	57%	32%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	59%	58%	29%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				68%	57%	53%	21%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				35%	56%	63%	44%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				46%	54%	62%	47%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	42%	51%	35%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				35%	53%	53%	41%	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	53%	61%	-8%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	58%	-20%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	56%	-20%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	41%	59%	-18%	64%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	60%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	53%	-19%
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 Measure of Academic Progress (MAP)
iReady Diagnostic

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	65%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	33%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	44%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	44%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	0%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	43%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	21%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	30%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	5%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	31%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	16%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	35%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	11%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	100%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	48%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	17%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	31%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	11%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	40%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	21%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	35%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	21%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	67%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	37%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	20%

Subgroup Data Review

	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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups											
SWD	16	21	8	27	26		18				
HSP	18			36							
WHT	39	38	20	43	48	27	47				
FRL	33	39	17	40	46	36	44				

	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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups											
SWD	26	50	57	19	45	50	17				
WHT	42	56	68	35	46	43	34				
FRL	44	56	63	35	48	44	38				

	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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups											
SWD	10	12	10	25	29	7	21				
WHT	32	29	25	42	44	31	43				
FRL	27	24	19	40	41	35	35				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	266
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	27
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	37
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	36
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?

40% or more students are performing below proficiency (Level 1 and 2) in Math in Number and Operations-Fractions across all grade levels. In Reading, 50% (Level 1 and 2) of students are performing below proficiency in Integrating Knowledge and Ideas, and Key Ideas and Details across all grade levels.

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

Waller students need to improve in the area of Number and Operations-Fractions, and Operations, Algebraic Thinking, and Numbers Base Ten. Waller students need to improve, meet proficiency levels in Integration of Knowledge and Ideas and Key Ideas and Details. The component with the greatest decrease for the 2018-2019 school year was Math Achievement by 9%. In 2018 the Math achievement was 44% and in 2019 it decreased to 35%. A contributing factor to our math scores would be the lack of fidelity by teachers while using the Eureka curriculum. Another contributing factor was the lack of fundamental skills such as base ten, number sense, multiplication, division, fluency, addition and subtraction with multi-digit numbers, etc.

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

Contributing factors include, but are not limited to student absences, recovering from a Category 5 Hurricane to include home displacement, students performing 1-2 years below grade level, social emotional health needs. Global pandemic has greatly impacted the consistencing of solid, regaulr classroom instruction (ongoing).New actions will include a vetted Social Emotional Program (The Be Kind People Project and Trauma Sensitive Classroom Programs), Daily MTSS intervention plan, Small group instruction to meet the below grade level deficits, and community stakeholders supporting the needs of the families in the Waller school community.

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

The data component with the most improvement was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile with a 47% increase from 21% in 2018 to 68% in 2019. Waller Elementary implemented a school wide 30-minute intervention block with small group instruction. Data driven discussions took place during weekly PLC's to address summative and formative assessment data, MAP (NWEA) scores, and intervention data.

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

Contributing factors include, but are not limited to student absences, recovering from a Category 5 Hurricane to include home displacement, students performing 1-2 years below grade level, social emotional health needs. New actions will include a vetted Social Emotional Program (The Be Kind People Project and Trauma Sensitive Classroom Programs), Daily MTSS intervention plan, Small group instruction to meet the below grade level deficits, and community stakeholders supporting the needs of the families in the Waller school community.

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

K-5 content based literacy (on grade level), which builds content knowledge with rich, authentic text. K-5 90 Minute Reading block with a focus on small group instruction to include intervention at students level. An additional 30 minutes reading time during WIN time (What I Need Time) to focus on interventions. Small group differentiated instruction building on the core content. Differentiated activities for MTSS and ESE supports to build on core content knowledge.
K-5 Math curriculum which teaches number and operations using a developmental progression. Prepare problems and use them in whole-class instruction while assisting student in monitoring and reflection on the problem solving process. Shows visual representations, expose students to multiple problem solving strategies. Helps students recognize and articulate mathematical concepts and notation.

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

1. iReady training each month to include district level training for each grade level.
2. HMH "virtual" training through Canvas completed monthly/quarterly.
3. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) utilizing student work protocol process. Focus on small group instruction with PLC input into what/how students will work in small groups based on needs of students (individual).
4. PLC data chats, weekly (common assessment data), and monthly (with MTSS staff), to ensure interventions/student needs are identified and instruction is aligned to expectation level of the standard to reach/gain skills toward grade level proficiency.
5. PLC planning days (quarterly), and as needed throughout the school year.

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

1. Classroom observations and teacher feedback.
2. MTSS data chats with teacher/administrations (MTSS Team) to discuss specific intervention strategy of individual students. Intervention teacher for K-2, and Intervention teacher for 3-5.
3. PARA support on each grade level for small group support and remediation using the HMH curriculum.
4. Utilize Literacy Coach to supports needs for HMH/iReady curriculum.
5. Implement Bay District Schools curriculum in Eureka Math with fidelity each day during specified time in the master schedule.
6. Use district designed curriculum guides to plan, prepare for instruction (Eureka Math).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Waller Elementary will increase student proficiency levels in the area of Reading by identifying specific student needs and deficits and using appropriate data to plan and provide interventions and instruction. Rationale focusing on student needs will allow students to gain proficiency in Reading. Small group instruction provides teachers opportunity to teach skill deficits at students individual level. Data shows that students working in small group with explicit instruction at the student level significantly increases student growth toward mastery.
Measurable Outcome:	Waller Elementary students will increase in reading proficiency to at least 50% achieving proficiency level or above, as measured by Spring FSA for grades 3-5 and district assessment for K-2.
Monitoring:	1. I- Ready - 2020-2021 2. MAP- previous years data Small group instructional groups will provide data for progress monitoring 1. HMH BOY Assessment 2. I-Ready Data 3. Bay Literature Resources 4. Weekly HMH Assessments 5. District Common Assessments - the end of module assessments 6. Admin walk throughs (*) 7. MTSS Data Chats and progress monitoring 8. PLC Data Chats and progress monitoring
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gina McNally (mcnalgl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The main evidence-based strategy students will engage in is flexible grouping in a small group setting. Other strategies in place to support this strategy are as follows: 1. Flexible Grouping - Teachers will use I-ready data and other data for flexible grouping of students in small groups. 2. I-Ready 3. Research-based interventions-HMH (provided by K-2 and 3-5 Intervention teachers) * Phonemic Awareness K-2nd * HMH lessons for 1st-5th 4. District Pacing Guide - HMH- Small Group Lessons 5. Complex Texts - readworks.org 6. iReady 7. Professional lesson planning protocol as needed for professional development. 8. Interventionists targeting Tier 2 and Tier 3 students (one for grades K-2 and one for grades 3-5) 9. District Reading Coach integrated throughout PLC meetings
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research supports the positive outcomes that small group instruction has on reading achievement and future success in school. Also, this is a strategy supported by our district and our state. There is a wealth of information based on intense small group instruction that can close the achievement gap for all students. Some resources we will use (but not limited to) are district personnel, research-based curriculum, research-based technology and research-based strategies (see above). Small group instruction benefits subgroups of students such as students in Tier ii and Tier III, in the ESOL program and in the ESE

program. In addition, on level students and high-achieving students individual needs are met to increase reading skills.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our schools social emotional curriculum for the 2021-2022 school year is The "Be Kind" Project which implements character education, respect, and initiates a positive social change. It coincides with the Trauma Sensitive Classroom project that we sought out for our Teachers and staff to use a proactive and responsive approach directly with our students dealing with trauma.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the amount of instructional time lost due to ISS and OSS by 20% and increase student engagement in the learning process through the development of academic goals and social behavior goals (student-led).
Monitoring:	Discipline referrals will go down by 20% while implementing the Be Kind Project as well as the Trauma Sensitive Classrooms.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary-Margaret Register (regism@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students academic achievement will go up when their basic needs are met first. Trauma Sensitive Classrooms (TSC) goes beyond realizing and recognizing trauma to training and coaching teachers on practical, evidence-informed strategies to use with students. In addition, the Be Kind Project offers experiences and project-based learning, students are equipped with a solid framework for decision-making and taking accountability for building respectful interpersonal relationship skills, improving academic results, and forming enduring values.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students live in a rural poverty area and have experienced hardships in the last couple of years. They know nothing but trauma from the devastation of Hurricane Michael, the Pandemic, and matters that go on in their own homes. Implementing these programs at school gives them an outlet to express their feelings and work through whatever they are personally enduring to set them up for success.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data concludes that the economically disadvantaged sub-group from Waller Elementary is, on average, 11% less proficient than students who are not.
Measurable Outcome:	The outcome the school plans to achieve is to decrease the average gap between groups by 3%.
Monitoring:	Providing adequate instruction, food, and resources are key for bridging the gap between the two groups. This also includes monitoring the following: 1. Holding students to high expectations 2. Student mental wellness through Social Emotional Learning 3. Availability to Positive Role Models 4. Student access to books
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Josephine Davis (davisje@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data based instruction is the key strategy that will be implemented for this particular Area of Focus. This will include the following individual strategies: 1. Implementation of a clear, consistent, and positive school-wide behavior plan 2. Reviewing discipline data as a PLC 3. Increasing opportunities for parents to attend school-based events
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale involved with selecting this strategy comes from the idea that with students that are considered economically disadvantaged, they need structure and support to help them succeed.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the current released data, 32% of the third grade students tested scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally, 33% percent of third grade students tested scored a Level 2 on 2021 FSA ELA. This represents a total of 65% of third grade students that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.
	Based on the current released data 31% of tested fourth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 27% of tested fourth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 58% of fourth graders that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.
	Based on the current released data 28% of tested fifth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 29% of tested fifth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 57% 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 5 percent increase in the percentage of proficient students on the 2022 FSA ELA. This will increase proficiency from 35% to 40%.
	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 42% to 45%.
	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 43% to 46%.
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:	Gina McNally (mcnalgl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Bay County has adopted a new state approved ELA Curriculum, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH), which is correlated with the FL BEST Standards. This curriculum is designed to provide quality instruction aligned to BEST standards through a gradual release model starting with whole group lessons then 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. 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 be monitored through i-Ready. 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. Students will be assigned individualized lessons to address learning deficits and participate in growth monitoring assessments frequently 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.

Person Responsible   Gina McNally (mcnalgl@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   Gina McNally (mcnalgl@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   Gina McNally (mcnalgl@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.

Compared to other elementary schools within the state of Florida, Waller Elementary has a high overall incident rate for an elementary school. The primary areas of concern as reflected in discipline data for the 19-20 school year are Inappropriate Behavior/Language and Physical Attack. Secondary concerns include Defiance/Insubordination and Classroom Disruptions. These instances had increased in the 20-21 school and are likely the result of sustained trauma incurred from Hurricane Michael in October 2018 and the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic shut down in March 2020. To create a positive school culture and environment, Waller Elementary has begun implementing the Be Kind People Project in conjunction with the Trauma Sensitive Classroom Project. The goal of these projects is to promote kindness, responsibility, advocacy for self, and to promote positive behavior as demonstrated in a reduction of discipline referrals. In addition to social emotional learning lessons to encourage positive behavior, Waller Elementary and surrounding local organizations and churches are working together to provide the basic needs of students. The needs to be me are food items for home, clothing, shoes, and school supplies. The Waller Elementary Parent Liaison and School-based Social Worker are working directly with the community organizations to provide these needs to all Waller students as appropriate. Meeting the basic needs of Waller Elementary students and implementing social emotional learning through the Be Kind People Project and the Trauma Sensitive Classroom project, it is the goal to have a reduction in discipline referrals from two referrals per day to one referral per day. This will be monitored daily by the School Administration. The behavior team (School Counselor, the Student Wellness team [Triad], and Administration) will review trends in behavioral data monthly and discuss effective interventions used in reducing behaviors and discipline referrals.

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.

Waller Elementary has a positive school culture and is exemplified in its environment. Our mission is to develop the whole child by bringing enlightenment through empowerment. To address the whole child, we utilize resources at the school level and at the district level. School level services include the School Counselor, mental health counselors, triad team for student wellness, Promise paraprofessionals, and mentors.

Waller Elementary implements the Be Kind People Project to build character. We strive to teach our students the five components of positive character development.
1. Self-Awareness through positivity and honesty
2. Self-Management through thankfulness and consideration
3. Social Awareness through respect and helpfulness
4. Relationship Skills through friendship and supporting others
5. Responsible Decision-Making through responsibility and encouragement of others

Waller Elementary is also a part of the Yale University Trauma Sensitive Classroom Project. Each classroom is provided with calming resources to build a Peace Corner for students to have a "safe space" to cool down, reflect, gather their thoughts, and prepare for difficult tasks and transitions. The Trauma Sensitive Classroom Project also implements Mindful Moments for teachers and students to discuss strategies in self de-escalation and problem-solving.

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

Gina McNally - Principal
JoBeth Davis - Assistant Administrator
Mary-Margaret Register - School Counselor
Erin Bruner - Triad (Licensed Social Worker)
Judy Wade - Triad
Mariah Whitaker - Triad
Ivan Larriviere - School-based Social Worker
Patty Emfinger - Promise Paraporfessional
LaRonda Branch - Behavior Paraprofessional
Nicole Mauldin - Elevate Bay Mentor

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged**	$0.00
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**