Cedar Grove Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cedar Grove Elementary School

2826 E 15TH ST, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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 (46%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide]
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here].	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cedar Grove Elementary School

2826 E 15TH ST, 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.

The mission at Cedar Grove Elementary School is to develop the whole child by empowering leaders and creating and atmosphere of excellence and personal growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:
Cedar Grove prepares our leaders today to empower leaders of tomorrow.

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
Wojnowski, Sheila	Principal	Coach team members Develop team strengths and improve weaknesses Identify team goals and evaluate team progresshttps://www.floridacims.org/plans/47346/edit/35005#abody2
Libby, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Bylsma, Cody	Assistant Principal	
Llorens, Yesenia	Assistant Principal	
English, Carissa	Teacher, K-12	
Rivers, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Akers, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Bass, Melody	Teacher, K-12	
Peterson, Wanda	Teacher, K-12	
Ferns, Kelli	Other	
Grider, Elena	Teacher, K-12	
Ammons, Yvonne	School Counselor	
Baxley, Adrian	Teacher, ESE	
Echols, Amanda	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Cynthia Walker

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.*
0

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

560

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

6

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

3

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	87	88	80	76	91	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518
Attendance below 90 percent	27	19	14	15	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	3	2	7	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	8	6	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	7	7	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	48	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	49	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	5	4	9	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	6	8	4	18	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	9	10	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	88	90	82	98	108	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	32	32	35	32	30	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	88	90	82	98	108	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	32	32	35	32	30	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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				33%	55%	57%	29%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	59%	58%	35%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				70%	57%	53%	52%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				25%	56%	63%	34%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				41%	54%	62%	37%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	42%	51%	38%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				34%	53%	53%	38%	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	27%	61%	-34%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	28%	58%	-30%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	56%	-24%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	25%	62%	-37%	62%	-37%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	24%	59%	-35%	64%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2021					
	2019	20%	54%	-34%	60%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	23%	54%	-31%	53%	-30%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA MAP data for grades 1-5.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	x	x	35/102 34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	25/86 29%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	10/27 37%
	English Language Learners	x	x	2/14 14%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	x	x	36/102 35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	28/86 33%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	9/27 33%
	English Language Learners	x	x	2/14 14%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	18/108 17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	15/84 18%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	2/26 8%
	English Language Learners	x	x	0/14 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	32/102 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	27/84 32%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	5/26 19%
	English Language Learners	x	x	2/14 14%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	26/92 28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	18/74 24%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	2/20 10%
	English Language Learners	x	x	2/10 20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	24/92 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	15/74 20%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	3/20 15%
	English Language Learners	x	x	1/10 10%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	27/109 25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	23/93 25%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	4/30 13%
	English Language Learners	x	x	5/14 36%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	21/109 19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	19/93 20%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	4/30 13%
	English Language Learners	x	x	3/14 21%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	23/113 20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	17/89 19%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	3/33 9%
	English Language Learners	x	x	2/23 9%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	16/113 14%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	11/89 12%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	2/33 6%
	English Language Learners	x	x	1/23 4%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	x	x	13/112 12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	x	x	10/89 11%
	Students With Disabilities	x	x	2/33 6%
	English Language Learners	x	x	2/23 9%

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	8	36	58	11	11	18	4				
ELL	13	58		21	46						
BLK	10	28		9	14		7				
HSP	7	38		21	41						
MUL	45			50							
WHT	23	43		23	21		15				
FRL	14	33	63	20	25	25	10				

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	34	36	29	36	45	50				
BLK	27	61	85	19	45	73	13				
HSP	20			36							
MUL	50			36							
WHT	39	54		27	28	36	47				
FRL	32	58	69	23	41	58	34				

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	32	44	56	33	33	29	27				
BLK	19	29	55	28	39	42	31				
HSP	50			42							
MUL	43	30		46							
WHT	31	39	60	36	35	40	41				
FRL	24	27	50	29	28	29	33				

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	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	241
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	14
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	23
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	48
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	
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	25
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	28
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?

When we looked at our assessment data across grade levels, each grade level has only 3-5 students who are proficient In both ELA and math. For our sub groups, we looked at our white, African-American, and Hispanic populations. Across all grades, students performed below level by one to three grade levels. The data did show that 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students gained skills, and were able to function at 2 grades below level or less at a higher rate than the 1st and 2nd graders. Our Hispanic population historically performed at a lower rate than our white and African-American population.

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

When we looked at our assessment data across grade levels, each grade level has only 3-5 students who are proficient In both ELA and math. For our sub groups, we looked at our white, African-American, and Hispanic populations. Across all grades, students performed below level by one to three grade levels. The data did show that 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students gained skills, and were able to function at 2 grades below level or less at a higher rate than the 1st and 2nd graders. Our Hispanic population historically performed at a lower rate than our white and African-American population.

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

Due to the pandemic and the hurricane that we faced in 2018, our students have missed out on a complete school year for the past three years. We have ELL students who come to our school with incomplete prior education and they're also learning English as a second language. We'll work on bridging the gap for our students in the area of learning gains by working with them on skills to access

grade level material, as well as working with them at their instructional level to build their skills to work toward proficiency.

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

Our science scores for fifth graders show the most Improvement. Though our students are assessed on proficiency, the growth we saw in our number of level two students was impressive. 41% of our students on our 2021 SSSA assessment scored level 2s. On the 2018 SSSA assessment the students had 28% of their scores at a level 2. The improvement is over 13% points.

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

Staff have worked for the past 3 years encouraging lower grades to teach science with fidelity. The focus for our teachers has been on teaching the nature of science, using hands on science experiments and focusing on science vocabulary.

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

We need to teach students to access grade level text by focusing on text marking of their grade level text. We will also work with grade level academic and text vocabulary. In addition we will work on accelerating student reading skills by using our new HMH curriculum and our new iReady program. We plan to build a love for reading by using the Accelerated Reading program.

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.

We provided teachers with summer inservice on the new HMH curriculum. They also engaged in online CANVAS training that addressed HMH as well. We have district staff who are providing on site HMH training as well. The teachers work in the PLCs to dig into the curriculum. iReady training has also been offered during the summer and as part of inservice. iReady is also offering ongoing training throughout the school year. Teachers are also working with the program, using the training they received on the diagnostic component to track student progress. We also have a district literacy coach who supports staff with implementation of the new programs and offers individualized one on one and group sessions to help teachers bridge the gap.

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

We will utilize our Learning Academy, which services our tier 3 ELA and math students four times a week with interventions. Teachers have a small group session built into their weekly schedules for both ELA and math. This time is set aside for filling the gaps for our students. Our district coaches (math and ELA) are available to support our teachers in implementing the curriculum. We also have our administrative team who are supporting teachers in both ELA and math by acting as coaches.The iReady program works at students' instructional levels. Within the program, there is a Toolbox and lessons that extend instruction when students struggle.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reviewing Discipline Referral (DR) data from 2020/2021, 297 incidents were documented for inappropriate behavior/language. This number decreased from the 352 incidents documented in 2019/2020 (-55). However, defiance/insubordination/non-compliance increased from 178 in 2019/2020 to 257 in 2020/2021 (+79) Our suspension numbers (ISS and OSS) were higher in most grade levels too. The following data compares 2019/2020 suspensions to 2020/2021 suspension: KG- went from 110 to 67 suspensions (-43) 1st- went from 122 to 130 suspensions (+8) 2nd- went from 65 to 88 suspensions (+23) 3rd- went from 45 to 79 suspensions (+34) 4th- went from 36 to 133 suspensions (+97) 5th- went from 65 to 24 suspensions (-41)
Measurable Outcome:	Student suspensions will decrease by 3 students per grade level from the 2020/2021 school year to the 2021/2022 school year as noted by Focus data.
Monitoring:	-Use Focus to monitor suspensions (EWS reviewed monthly) -Use CWT to monitor implementation of Leader in Me -Monthly MTSS data meetings with lead stakeholders on student data in regard to behavior -Biweekly Intervention/Threat Assessment meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cody Bylsma (bylsmdc@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are implementing the Leader in Me (LIM) process with fidelity at Cedar Grove. We have integrated the habits all over our school, and have had training for all of our staff in the use of the habits. We have boards that track student data in behavior and other boards that remind students of our seven habits. We have a culture and environment team that monitors our school environment and a behavior and intervention team that looks at our data to determine interventions using LIM and SEL strategies to support our students,
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our first habit, being proactive, requires the individual to take care of who they are. It also requires them to take ownership of their actions. This habit alone can lower our students suspensions, as they think through their actions before they do them.

Action Steps to Implement

Employ full time behavior interventionist to work with students on social skills.
Employ promise para to assist with social skills, student redirection, and supporting students' positive behavior
Provide a parent liaison to assist with parent/community connection to help reduce behaviors
Utilize Triad members to assist with social skills, student redirection, and supporting students' positive behavior

Person Responsible	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

.Action:LIM professional development and implementation
Activity:

Pre-inservice instruction on LIM (Administration and peer teachers,
faculty meeting
Teachers using LIM throughout their instructional day
Monitoring:
Sign in sheets, CWT, Agendas (Teachers, Administration), Lesson plan/PLC
minutes template
Action: Restorative Practices (Circle)
Activity:
Training for staff as needed
Teacher using Circle and LIM to build tier I Character Education skills
Monitoring:
Sign in sheets, CWT, Lesson plan/PLC minutes template

Person Responsible	Cody Bylsma (bylsmcd@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action: Review of early warning system monthly
Activity:
Review EWS information during MTSS, Intervention Meeting monthly
Develop strategies for assisting struggling students identified by the EWS
data (Intervention Teachers)
Monitoring:
Agendas of meetings, Social Emotional Learning spreadsheet
Action: Mental Health Supports
Activity:
Hope Team supports of students through social groups and individual
counselling
Behavior/ISS/Promise Paras and Intervention Teacher support students with
strategies to gain skill in
interacting in socially .
Monitoring:
Social Emotional Learning spreadsheet, Promise Para spreadsheet

Person Responsible	Yesenia Llorens (llorey@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students need math strategies and skills to improve proficiency. The 2021 FSA data showed that our 3rd grade students were at 20% proficiency, our 4th grade was at 14% proficiency and 5th grade students were at 20% proficiency. Our overall learning gains for 4th grade in math were 25% and in 5th grade they were 26%. Our lowest 25% learning gains for 4th grade were 25% and 29% for 5th grade.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to focus on increasing all of our grade levels overall proficiency on the FSA in math by utilizing the Eureka Math curriculum, iReady and Zearn. We plan to increase our proficiency from a school wide percentage of 18% to 23%, which is a gain of 5 percentage points.
Monitoring:	Math instruction will be monitored for implementation by : using classroom walkthroughs (CWT) to view teacher instruction Monitoring student progress through end of the module assessments utilizing Gradebook Reviewing iReady administrative reports for use of the program with fidelity Monitoring Zearn use
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cody Bylsma (bylsmcd@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidenced based strategy that we will implement will be the teaching of the math block using Eureka Math with fidelity. We will also use iReady, a national evidence based program that is tied to FSA standards to help fill in the gaps for the students. We will also use Zearn, a computer based program, to reinforce the concepts taught in Eureka Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Eureka Math contains these components: -it is research based -it is standards based -it uses strategies to teach students math concepts -it has a sprint component to work with students on fluency -curriculum takes students through different mathematical stages (concrete, representation, abstract)

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of Eureka Math and Zearn (computer based program):
Action: Professional Development
Activity:
PD as needed
Admin (math coach)
Ongoing review of curriculum during PLCs
Monitoring:
emails, sign in sheets, PLC minutes/lesson plans,CWT forms, Admin attendance in PLCs

Person Responsible	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Utilizing iReady:
Action:
PD during the summer and ongoing throughout the school year
Teacher review of iReady reports to determine student progress and time requirements
Monitor:

Sign in sheets, lesson plans, Admin pulls reports

Person Responsible   Cody Bylsma (bylsmcd@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA		
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Florida State Assessment measures students' ability to demonstrate mastery of state standards in ELA. Students scoring a Level 3 or above are considered to meet grade level mastery of state standards measured on the FSA. Based on the current released data 58% of the third grade students tested scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 23% 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 68% of tested fourth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 17% of tested fourth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 85% of fourth graders that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency. Based on the released data 44% of tested fifth grade students scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 36% of tested fifth graders scored a Level 2. This represents a total of 80% 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 15% to 18%. 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 20% to 23%.
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:	Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Bay County has adopted a new state approved ELA Curriculum , Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, which is correlated with the new FL BEST Standards. This curriculum is designed to provide quality instruction on the new BEST standards through a gradual release model starting with whole group lessons then allowing students to interact with the text and practice the skills in small group and individualized activities. In addition the curriculum includes Table Top lessons designed to differentiate instruction in small groups and enables grade level texts to be accessible to all learners. In addition, the curriculum includes Table Top lessons for ELL students allowing them to access and interact with grade level texts and skills as well. Along with the implementation of the HMH curriculum, students' progress will also be monitored through iReady. Students will participate in diagnostic assessments in Fall, Winter and Spring. This diagnostic data will be used to identify students that need additional support and interventions. In addition students will be assigned individualized lessons to address learning deficits. Students will participate in growth monitoring assessments more frequently in order to determine student progress and needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Into Reading core adopted instructional materials for K-5 English Language Arts. The series was reviewed and approved by the FLDOE for inclusion on the State Adopted List at time of adoption and purchase. To improve instruction and learning, BDS teachers incorporate explicit, direct instruction (effect size of .60) adn scaffolding (effect size of. 82) based on Hattie's research (Visible Learning: John Hattie 2017)

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in Houghton Mifflin Harcourt virtual training facilitated by district ELA Instructional Specialists. This series of training will guide teachers in the implementation of the curriculum. Follow-up trainings will be conducted both virtually and in person by the district's ELA Instructional Specialists.

Monitoring :
Sign in sheets, AIMs transcript

Person Responsible Sheila Wojnowski (wojnosr@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.

Monitoring :
Lesson plan/PLC minutes template

Person Responsible Yesenia Llorens (llorey@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).

Monitoring :
Lesson plan/PLC minutes template, MTSS Universal spreadsheet, MTSS Sign-in Sheet, Tier 2/3 Instructional Groups spreadsheet, Para schedule

Person Responsible Yvonne Ammons (ammonym@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.

Cedar Grove ranked 483 out of 1,395 for elementary schools in incidents. That placed us in the low rating/rank overall in the state. When we look at the breakdown of the areas, we placed in the low incident rank for violent incidents. Our ranking was of 401/1395 when compared to all the state elementary schools. We ranked in the very low category for property incidents with a 1/1395 ranking in the state. In the drug/public order incidents, we were 996/1395 in the state. That ranked us in the high range. Our total number of suspensions were 1389/1395 in the state, our rating was very high in that category. This rating included both in school and out of school suspensions.

Our primary area of concern is school suspensions. We were 6 suspensions away from being the highest in the state. We will look at how we issue suspensions, both in school and out. We will look at other options to reduce our number of incidents. Our secondary area of concern was in drug/public order category. Within that category, classroom disruption was the area where we had all of our issues. We will monitor what students are doing to disrupt class and work on providing them with supports to decrease this area of concern.

We are implementing the Leader in Me (LIM) process with fidelity at Cedar Grove. We have integrated the habits all over our school, and have had training for all of our staff in the use of the habits. We have boards that track student data in behavior and other boards that remind students of our seven habits. We have a culture and environment team that monitors our school environment and a behavior and intervention team that looks at our data to determine interventions using LIM and SEL strategies to support our students,

Our first habit, being proactive, requires the individual to take care of who they are. It also requires them to take ownership of their actions. This habit alone can lower our students suspensions, as they think through their actions before they do them.

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.

Cedar Grove is a Leader in Me school. Leader in Me provides a model and process that addresses common challenges that are unique to elementary student. Parents, educators, and school administrators are concerned with their child's physical, mental, social, and economic well-being, all of which are factors

that can contribute to or hinder academic success. Teachers, staff, and administrators at Cedar Grove are empowered to provide support in all of these areas by creating a learning environment that addresses whole-child education with five Core Paradigms. These paradigms influence the behavior of staff, students, and their families. With a focus on the paradigms, teachers model lessons using The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People. These habits are utilized across campus to praise and reward students.

One paradigm focuses on the believe that everyone is a leader. Because of this, every student has a classroom job and can apply for a school-wide job. Some of the school-wide jobs include safety patrol, ITV, Campus Cleanup. Students will synergize with their peers to create a positive physical, mental, and emotional culture and environment.

We also have community supporters who donate funds and their time to support Lead in Me (LIM) and concepts that it employs. One sponsor gave our school $2500 to purchase items for LIM. Another sponsor will come to our school and help us as we celebrate students who make great choices. We have a couple from the community who will come to school daily/weekly to work with all of our students, put especially those that need additional habit support.

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

Sheila Wojnowski- Principal
Yesenia Llorens- Assistant Administrator
Cody Bylsma- Assistant Administrator/Lighthouse Coordinator
Kelli Ferns- Lighthouse Coordinator/Title I Coordinator
Amanda Echols- Lighthouse Action Team member
Jessica Rivers- Lighthouse Action Team member
Karen Cajote- Lighthouse Action Team member
Adrian Baxley- Lighthouse Action Team member

Part V: Budget

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

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