

Bay District Schools

# Hutchison Beach Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>25</b>

# Hutchison Beach Elementary School

12900 MIDDLE BEACH RD, Panama City, FL 32407

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Glenda Nouskhajian**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2012

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://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

---

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

## Hutchison Beach Elementary School

12900 MIDDLE BEACH RD, Panama City, FL 32407

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

We are dedicated to developing lifelong leaders. We strive to improve the quality of student performance within a safe environment. We facilitate students as they develop educational and personal goals. Our students are emerging leaders who will meet the challenges of a global society.

We believe and follow our "SPLASH" Pledge. Beach Dolphins are SAFE, POLITE, LEADERS, ACHIEVING, SUCCESS at HBES. Go Dolphins!

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

We are a community of leaders leaving a legacy! Our Instructional vision is for all students to be highly engaged in grade level assignments that are taught to the rigor of the standards in a risk free, collaborative and culturally responsive learning environment.

### 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
Nouskhajian, Glenda	Principal	Oversees all higher level operations, creates a safe learning environment, sets performance goals for both students and teachers, and oversees the process so that those goals are attained.
Shepard, Kayla	Assistant Principal	Serves as an educational leader and assists the Principal in the planning, coordination, and directing of activities and programs related to the administration of Beach.
Laberdesque, Sheila	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Chair
Adkins, Chasity	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Chair
Quinn, Mark	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Chair
King, Valerie	Instructional Media	Works collaboratively with school administration and staff to develop a media program that supports the curriculum; provides instructional leadership for the teaching of literacy skills.
Johnson, Priscilla	School Counselor	Supports students through child development, learning strategies, and social skills.
Bunk, Malori	School Counselor	Supports students through child development, learning strategies, and social skills.
Nelson, Tamara	Instructional Coach	Instructional leader that trains teachers, provides resources, feedback, modeling and professional development to help Beach meet instructional and school improvement goals.
Shepard, Sabrina	Teacher, ESE	Provides support to the school community to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or Access curriculum, FSA, and accountability systems.
Fitzgerald, Lori	Teacher, K-12	Language expert that evaluates, instructs, and improves English proficiency as well as serves as a resource to Beach for English language concerns.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Thursday 8/23/2012, Glenda Nouskhajian



**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.*

4

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

50

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

650

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

10

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

11

## Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

#### 2021-22

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	93	95	110	124	106	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	649
Attendance below 90 percent	25	22	23	16	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	25	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	20	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	10	13	18	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
	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	0	0	0	10	13	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	8	6	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/26/2021

**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	60	105	106	106	107	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	4	23	20	10	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	11	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

**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	3	2	2	7	10	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	5	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	60	105	106	106	107	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	4	23	20	10	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	11	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

**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	3	2	2	7	10	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	5	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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				61%	55%	57%	59%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	59%	58%	56%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	57%	53%	51%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	56%	63%	62%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	54%	62%	45%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	42%	51%	26%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				61%	53%	53%	56%	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	52%	58%	-6%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	56%	6%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	63%	62%	1%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	59%	-9%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We used NWEA MAP for Grades K-5 three times a year for the 2020-2021 school year. Due to many students attending virtually at the start of the school year and absences due to quarantining the most accurate progress monitoring assessment that included the majority of our students was in the Spring.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		X	61/108 56%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	35/63 56%
	Students With Disabilities		X	13/21 62%
	English Language Learners		X	7/23 30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		X	67/107 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	38/62 61%
	Students With Disabilities		X	11/21 52%
	English Language Learners		X	12/23 52%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		X	58/119 49%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	28/63 44%
	Students With Disabilities		X	6/26 23%
	English Language Learners		X	2/16 13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		X	56/119 47%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	26/63 41%
	Students With Disabilities		X	6/26 23%
	English Language Learners		X	3/16 19%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		X	66/128 52%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	25/63 40%
	Students With Disabilities		X	8/26 31%
	English Language Learners		X	6/25 24%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		X	51/128 40%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	23/63 37%
	Students With Disabilities		X	7/26 27%
	English Language Learners		X	4/25 16%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		X	51/118 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	19/63 30%
	Students With Disabilities		X	1/8 6%
	English Language Learners		X	3/25 12%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		X	69/118 58%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	27/36 43%
	Students With Disabilities		X	5/18 28%
	English Language Learners		X	8/23 35%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		X	55/117 47%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	21/26 24%
	Students With Disabilities		X	7/17 41%
	English Language Learners		X	6/20 30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		X	53/116 46%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	24/62 39%
	Students With Disabilities		X	6/17 35%
	English Language Learners		X	5/19 26%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		X	60/115 52%
	Economically Disadvantaged		X	24/61 39%
	Students With Disabilities		X	9/15 53%
	English Language Learners		X	7/19 37%

### 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	29	58		49	67		33				
ELL	37	82		41	50		69				
BLK	22			32							
HSP	40	73		44	44		67				
MUL	48			71							
WHT	54	68		64	56		53				
FRL	34	58		48	44		44				
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	24	55	58	36	45	47	31				
ELL	42	58	75	49	58	53	31				
HSP	40	50	65	45	50	42	31				

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
MUL	65			71							
WHT	65	74	76	64	47	47	63				
FRL	50	56	48	58	52	56	57				
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	29	34	31	37	29	25	24				
ELL	45	62	62	42	24	18					
BLK	58			50							
HSP	44	55	54	42	28	8	46				
MUL	57	50		54	55						
WHT	63	57	50	68	48	28	61				
FRL	57	57	56	60	43	26	51				

### 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	



Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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	56
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	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	59
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	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?

Based on Winter to Spring NWEA/MAP RIT scores for grades K-5, we had a mean increase in both ELA and Math scores. Even though we had a mean increase, our scores fell below the National RIT. FSA ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% in grades 3-5 have increased with a notable increase within our subgroup SWD. FSA Math learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25% in grades 3-5 have increased with a notable increase within our subgroup SWD.

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

Scores on both the FSA and NWEA/MAP indicate the greatest need for improvement in the area of ELA specifically in subtopics of informational text.

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

Face to face instruction decreased due to the district's implementation of a hybrid online/brick and mortar model. Attendance decreased due to Covid and the use of the hybrid model. We also had a change in the required ELA Curriculum. Our district-wide required EL curriculum in 2019 was discontinued for the 2020-21 school year.

For the 2021-22 school year, instruction is face to face in brick and mortar schools. The district implemented a new ELA HMH curriculum. All teachers received HMH training by the district, as well as from Beach. We have added Walk-to-read to our master schedule which allows an additional 30 minutes for remediation and enrichment in the area of ELA.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the FSA English Language Arts learning gains of the lowest 25%, an increase from 66% to 87%. This increase was significantly above the districts' 37%. In addition, there was a notable increase in the SWD subgroup.

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

During our weekly PLC meetings we use a collaborative and collective effort to ensure better results for students we serve. We consistently monitor our students in our monthly MTSS data meetings using the results to inform and improve our professional practice and respond to students who need interventions. We implemented Heggerty-Phonemic Awareness lessons for all K-3 students. Our new action in this area will be to implement a school-wide Walk to Read model with a focus on intervention/enrichment, this is embedded in our Master Schedule.

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

To accelerate learning we will intentionally scaffold instruction by determining the taxonomy of a lesson's standard and learning target, and then begin instruction at a lower taxonomy level, building understanding and confidence as we gradually ramp up the rigor. We will prioritize standards to make informed, conscious decisions about how much time and attention will be devoted to specific

standards in each grade level. Also, we will diagnose missed essential learning by working with colleagues to develop a strong diagnostic measure that can be used to determine student needs.

**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.**

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at Beach to support teachers and leaders will include an Academic Interventionist, Learning Cycles, and Canvas HMH Learning Modules. The Academic Interventionist will monitor data, provide support and additional resources. A mentor teacher will work collaboratively with new teachers through complete learning cycles throughout the year. The district has provided learning opportunities through Canvas to support HMH ELA implementation.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond include the implementation of iReady. iReady Learning provides personalized learning by connecting diagnostic data that addresses unfinished learning and engaging, rigorous resources for grade-level learning.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our area of focus is to increase English Language Arts Achievement. Our 2020-2021 FSA Scores, indicate that ELA Achievement dropped from 61% to 48%. The lowest ELA scores on the NWEA/ MAP fell under the instructional subareas of Informational Text, Vocabulary Acquisitions, and Key Ideas and Details.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	The intended outcome is to increase FSA English Language Arts Achievement from 48% to 58%.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	We will use iReady, FSA, MTSS, and HMH common assessments data to establish a baseline and identify students whose scores fall among our lowest quartile. We will have weekly PLC and monthly MTSS meetings with teachers, administrators, counselors interventionist and other stakeholders, to discuss each student and make instructional adjustments. To ensure that instruction is standards based, the BDS walkthrough tool will be used to monitor student progress.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Glenda Nouskhajian (nouskgt@bay.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Research shows that frequent data analysis combined with adjusted instruction increases student achievement. "In order to raise student achievement, schools must use diagnostic assessments to measure students' knowledge and skills at the beginning of each curriculum unit, on the spot assessments to check for understanding during instruction, and end of unit assessments and interim assessments to see how well students have learned. All of these enable teachers to make mid-course corrections and get students into interventions earlier." (Odden 2009 p. 23)
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	To truly impact proficiency and make learning gains, students must be exposed to on-grade level material and given the skills and strategies to grapple with on-grade level material. We will regularly review iReady personalized instruction and assessment data. We will adjust programming, scheduling, and support as needed.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students that are in this targeted group by using baseline data points from FSA and Fall iReady report.
2. PLC teams will meet weekly to discuss these students' progress, look for trends in the data, and make adjustments as needed to ensure success.
3. We will conduct monthly Instructional Leadership Team meetings to analyze data and vertical alignment to ensure all members of our staff are aware of all of our students and progress toward their goals.
4. We will conduct monthly MTSS meetings to analyze the intervention data and make any necessary adjustments.
5. Students will use their personal iReady data to create and monitor academic goals for Reading.
6. Teachers and Administration will review iReady reports on a weekly basis.
7. Teachers will implement a minimum of 45 minutes of personalized iReady instruction each week.

**Person Responsible** Kayla Shepard (shepakj@bay.k12.fl.us)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Looking at the 20-21 MTSS data, 75 students in K-5 were in Tier III reading groups. On the Spring NWEA/MAP assessment data indicated we were below the norm in grades 2nd-4th.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	We want to decrease the number of Tier III MTSS students by 50%. We strive to be above the norm in the Spring using the iReady diagnostic.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	We will use iReady data, HMH common assessments, and MTSS weekly progress monitoring data to identify MTSS Tier III students who remain below the norm. We will have weekly PLC data meetings with teachers, administrators, and interventionists. As well as monthly MTSS data meetings with teachers, counselors, administrators, and interventionists. The focus of both meetings will be on student progress and making instructional adjustments to achieve our measurable outcome.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Glenda Nouskhajian (nouskgt@bay.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Differentiated instruction is not a single strategy but rather a framework that teachers can use to implement a variety of strategies, many of which are evidence-based. The evidence-based strategy being implemented and monitored for this Area of Focus is grouping students for instruction (especially students with significant learning gaps).
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	When a teacher tries to teach something to the entire class at the same time, "chances are, one-third of the kids already know it, one-third of the kids will get it, and the remaining third won't. So two-thirds of the children are wasting their time." Lilian Katz, University of Illinois. Teachers who differentiate instruction alter assignments to meet the needs of the students, assess students on an ongoing basis to determine their readiness levels, use assessment results to adjust instruction as needed, provide a variety of options for how students can learn and demonstrate their knowledge, strive to make lessons engaging and meaningful, employ different grouping formats for instruction (e.g., whole-class, small groups, independent instruction) and use flexible grouping. We will regularly review MTSS progress monitoring data, iReady personalized instruction, and weekly assessment data. We will adjust programming, scheduling and support as needed.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC teams will meet weekly to discuss the identified MTSS Tier III students, look for trends in the data, and make adjustments as needed to ensure success.
2. We will conduct monthly Instructional Leadership Team meetings to analyze data and vertical alignment to ensure all members of our staff are aware of all of our students and their progress toward the goal.
3. We will conduct monthly MTSS meetings to analyze the intervention data and make any necessary changes.
4. Students will use their progress monitoring data to create and monitor academic goals for Reading.
5. Teachers, administrators, and interventionist will review iReady reports on a weekly basis.
6. Interventionist and Reading Endorsed Teachers will analyze students' weekly progress monitoring data and adjust their Tier III instruction based on their students goals.

**Person Responsible** Kayla Shepard (shepakj@bay.k12.fl.us)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** will have fully active and functioning PLCs that includes participation, attendance and support by the assigned administrator.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**Monitoring:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

#### #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>Based on the current released data 27% of the third grade students tested scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 27% percent of third grade students tested scored a Level 2 on 2021 FSA ELA. This represents a total of 54% of third grade students that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.</p> <p>Based on the released data 31% of tested fourth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 29% of tested fourth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 60% of fourth graders that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>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 46% to 49%.</p> <p>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 40% to 43%.</p>
<b>Monitoring:</b>	<p>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.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>[no one identified]</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Bay County has adopted a new state approved ELA Curriculum , Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, which is correlated with the new FL BEST Standards. This curriculum is designed to provide quality instruction on the new BEST standards through a gradual release model starting with whole group lessons then allowing students to interact with the text and practice the skills in small group and individualized activities. In addition the curriculum includes Table Top lessons designed to differentiate instruction in small groups and enables grade level texts to be accessible to all learners. In addition, the curriculum includes Table Top lessons for ELL students allowing them to access and interact with grade level texts and skills as well. Along with the implementation of the HMM curriculum, students' progress will also be monitored through iReady. Students will participate in diagnostic assessments in Fall, Winter and Spring. This diagnostic data will be used to identify students that need additional support and interventions. In addition students will be assigned individualized lessons to address learning deficits. Students will participate in growth monitoring assessments more frequently in order to determine student progress and needs.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>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)</p>

#### 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 ration; time in intervention; intervention materials; instruction).

**Person Responsible** Glenda Nouskhajian (nouskgt@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.

**We reported 0.8 incidents per 100 students, which is rated lower than the state data at 1.0. Our In-School suspension dropped from 24 to 15. Our Out-of School suspension dropped from 23 to 18. We received a School rating of High for Violent Incidents & Drug/Public Order Incidents were High. We had 2 incidents involving bullying and harassment. However, it shows 1 sex offense reported, which is not accurate. We had 1 tobacco incident. Our average referrals were up 88% from 2019-2020. The highest frequency of inflations were due to inappropriate behavior. Our demographic breakdown of students who had the most referrals were from our white males in 1st and 3rd grade. For the 21-22 school year, we have implemented new protocols and procedures for behavior. Step 1: Determine if teacher has executed Tier 1 Classroom management (Whole Brain Teaching and Leader In Me). Step 2: Look at the Major vs Minor Matrix. Step 3: Student should go to their "Safe Seat" in the classroom. Step 4: If needed, student will then visit their "Buddy Room" to fill out a reflection sheet. Step 5: If the behavior continues, Admin. or Guidance will respond. We have also created a "Positive Office Referrals" for students who go above and beyond to improve their behavior. Our male population who received the most referrals last year, have been paired up with staff member for check in and out system. Our goal for the 21-22 school year is to decrease our referrals by 50%.**



## 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.

We are a Leader in Me Lighthouse School, where we create a leadership culture school-wide. Every student is empowered to create and track their personal and academic goals. Every student has the opportunity for a leadership role within the classroom and school community. We also use the Ron Clark House System. The House System has received National and International recognition for its success for creating a loving, dynamic learning environment that promotes academic excellence and fosters leadership to build a positive school culture.

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

Staff - Provide leadership opportunities for students and monitor their Wildly Important Goals.

Students - Write a goal and lead measures for reading and math. They will monitor their goals and keep a scoreboard in their leadership binder.

Parents- Apply the Leader in Me principles at home.

Community - Attend our annual Leadership Day, where all our students showcase their ongoing leadership goals and celebrations.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$101,165.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0081 - Hutchison Beach Elementary School	Other Federal		\$77,702.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional leader that trains teachers, provides resources, feedback, modeling and professional development to help Beach meet instructional and school improvement goals.</i>			
	6150	160-Other Support Personnel	0081 - Hutchison Beach Elementary School	Other Federal		\$12,664.00
			<i>Notes: The Parent Liaison will provide resources and support to help our families become more actively engaged in academics with the focus of ELA.</i>			

	5100	510-Supplies	0081 - Hutchison Beach Elementary School	Other Federal		\$6,511.00
			Notes: We have purchased Student & Parent Leaderships Guides that go with the Leader in Me Character Ed.			
	5100	510-Supplies	0081 - Hutchison Beach Elementary School	Other Federal		\$1,000.00
			Notes: We have purchased ink, headphones & mice to go along with IReady			
			0081 - Hutchison Beach Elementary School			\$3,288.00
			Notes: We have purchased Smores digital Newsletter for School and parent newsletters.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$55,327.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	150-Aides	0081 - Hutchison Beach Elementary School	Other Federal		\$55,327.00
			Notes: Paraprofessionals will focus on the Acceleration Model for our lowest quartile.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
					Total:	\$156,492.00