

Bay District Schools

# Deer Point 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>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Deer Point Elementary School

4800 HIGHWAY 2321, Panama City, FL 32404

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Rebecca Reeder**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
<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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%)
<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, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](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>23</b>

# Deer Point Elementary School

4800 HIGHWAY 2321, Panama City, FL 32404

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">72%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">21%</p>

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

Deer Point Elementary will work collaboratively to ensure the success of all students and staff through engaging, rigorous, and relevant learning activities.

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

Deer Point Anglers are respectful, independent and responsible leaders.

### 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
Reeder, Rebecca	Principal	<p>As principal, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students.</p> <p>As administrators, it is our responsibility to guide conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and provide shared leadership opportunities.</p>
Hudson, Crystal	Assistant Principal	<p>As principal, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students.</p> <p>As administrators, it is our responsibility to guide conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and provide shared leadership opportunities.</p>
Creel, Christy	Teacher, K-12	<p>As a teacher representative on the School Improvement Team, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students.</p> <p>As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.</p>
Creamer, Kelli	School Counselor	<p>As a guidance counselor representative on the School Improvement Team, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students.</p> <p>As a counselor, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.</p>
Thornton, Kaila	Teacher, K-12	<p>As a teacher representative on the School Improvement Team, it is vital we begin with the end in mind and monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning goals for all students.</p> <p>As teachers, it is our responsibility to participate in conversations about data and curriculum content, engage all stakeholders, and participate in shared leadership opportunities.</p>

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Rebecca Reeder

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

2



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

6

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

45

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

622

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

4

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

8

**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	96	96	75	112	87	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	562
Attendance below 90 percent	42	37	23	31	35	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	13	4	10	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	0	4	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Wednesday 9/8/2021

**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	84	74	87	78	86	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	18	17	10	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	2	3	7	2	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

**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	1	2	2	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	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	84	74	87	78	86	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	18	17	10	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	2	3	7	2	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

**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	1	2	2	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	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				56%	55%	57%	53%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	59%	58%	46%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	57%	53%	41%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	56%	63%	55%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				45%	54%	62%	61%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				24%	42%	51%	42%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				61%	53%	53%	42%	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	57%	61%	-4%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	58%	-8%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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.

NWEA MAP

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			56/95 59%
	Economically Disadvantaged			23/49 47%
	Students With Disabilities			18/29 62%
	English Language Learners			N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			62/95 65%
	Economically Disadvantaged			30/48 63%
	Students With Disabilities			15/29 52%
	English Language Learners			N/A
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			53/79 67%
	Economically Disadvantaged			21/35 60%
	Students With Disabilities			11/21 52%
	English Language Learners			N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			59/79 75%
	Economically Disadvantaged			22/35 63%
	Students With Disabilities			12/21 57%
	English Language Learners			N/A

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			59/94 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged			26/47 55%
	Students With Disabilities			11/27 41%
	English Language Learners			N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			60/94 64%
	Economically Disadvantaged			27/47 57%
	Students With Disabilities			11/27 41%
	English Language Learners			N/A

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			34/83 41%
	Economically Disadvantaged			12/44 27%
	Students With Disabilities			7/23 30%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			44/83 53%
	Economically Disadvantaged			19/44 43%
	Students With Disabilities			7/23 30%
	English Language Learners			NA

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			53/92 58%
	Economically Disadvantaged			22/46 48%
	Students With Disabilities			7/28 25%
	English Language Learners			1/3 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			55/93 59%
	Economically Disadvantaged			21/46 46%
	Students With Disabilities			8/29 28%
	English Language Learners			1/3 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			59/93 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged			24/46 52%
	Students With Disabilities			11/29 38%
	English Language Learners			1/3 33%

**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	25	27	42	27	32	18	24				
BLK	38			69							
HSP	42			50							
MUL	53			47							
WHT	51	45	53	55	56	33	58				
FRL	37	38		47	42	47	38				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	39	35	24	34	16	50				
BLK	38	38		48	31						
MUL	46			38							
WHT	57	63	47	54	45	28	55				

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
FRL	52	58	42	46	40	18	60				
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	30	30	38	41	54	39	20				
BLK	26	38	38	27	48	50					
MUL	65	38		76	69						
WHT	54	49	42	56	63	43	47				
FRL	43	44	39	46	58	37	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	50
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	
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	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	50
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	50
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	42
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?**

Overall learning gains on FSA is higher than the district and state. Overall math achievement on FSA is lower than the district and state. Increase in ELA achievement, learning gains, and lowest quartile from 2018-2019. Decrease in math achievement, learning gains, and lowest quartile from 2018-2019. On NWEA progress monitoring overall students with disabilities scored lower than their peers in all grade levels except first grade where they scored higher. 4th grade ELA is significantly lower than other grade levels on NWEA progress monitoring overall and in subgroups.

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

Students with disabilities scored lower than their peers in reading and math.

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

Many students began the year enrolled in distance learning. Limited professional development opportunities for teachers when compared to past years. ESE resource teachers had a much larger caseload of students they were responsible for due to staffing difficulties dur to multiple COVID absences.

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

ELA learning gains are higher than the district and state average.  
Science achievement showed a 16% increase from 2018-2019.

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

Implementation of Exact Path last year. This year we are implementing iReady which will provide similar resources to students and teachers but will also focus more specifically on individual student needs.

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

Implementation of iReady.  
Early detection of student needs and consistent implementation of MTSS.

#### **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.**

Training for teachers on the new ELA curriculum. Vertical grade level meetings.  
Weekly PLC data chats. Monthly school level data chats.  
iReady training.

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

Weekly PLC meetings to include grade level teachers, ESE resource teachers, and administration.  
 Weekly PLC data review and monthly MTSS review of student data.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile on the state assessment is lower than the district and state average. Increase student learning gains for the lowest quartile by identifying specific student needs using appropriate data to plan and provide interventions and instruction.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile on the state assessment from 47% to 52%.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Weekly PLC data chats. Monthly MTSS data chats.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MTSS support for identified students.</li> <li>2. Increasing support in classrooms via ESE resource teachers.</li> <li>3. Instruction and progress monitoring through iReady.</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	By providing individualized instruction through iReady, additional supports for the lowest quartile through MTSS, and ESE supports for students who have an IEP, our lowest quartile students are expected to receive more focused instruction and interventions and their learning gains will meet expectations.

#### Action Steps to Implement

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

**Area of Focus** Behavior  
**Description and Rationale:** Deer Point will reduce disruptive behavior and time out of class and build a build a positive school climate through school-wide implementation of character education and behavior improvement initiatives. During the 2020-2021 school year Deer PPoint averaged 28 discipline referrals per month.

**Measurable Outcome:** Student referrals resulting in lost instructional time will decrease by 10%.

**Monitoring:** Students who are receiving MTSS behavior supports will be monitored and discussed by the behavior team every month.  
 The behavior team will meet monthly to discuss referrals and identify any trends.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Crystal Hudson (hudsocj@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Leader in Me, BDS 360

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Leader in Me is an evidence-based, comprehensive school improvement model that empowers students with the leadership and life skills they need to thrive. By teaching, modeling, and expecting students to live the 7 habits of the LiM model, intrinsic motivation to make appropriate choices and treat all with respect should result in our meeting our goal of reducing discipline incidents and loss of instructional time.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

**#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.  
 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 27% of the third grade students tested scored a Level 1 on the 2021 FSA ELA. Additionally 30% percent of third grade students tested scored a Level 2 on 2021 FSA ELA. This represents a total of 57% of third grade students that participated in FSA testing scored below the state's criteria for proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Students in grade 3 will demonstrate an increase of at least 3 percent increase in the percentage of proficient students on the 2022 FSA ELA. This will increase proficiency from 43% to 46%.

**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:**

Rebecca Reeder (reederl@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) 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** Rebecca Reeder (reederl@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** Rebecca Reeder (reederl@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** Rebecca Reeder (reederl@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.

**Deer Point had zero violent, property, or drug/public order incidents. This data will continue to be reviewed at the monthly behavior team meetings. Students in need of support will be identified at the earliest signs.**

### 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.**

The Leader in Me program is taught to all students and staff and the paradigms within become a common language throughout the school. Deer Point also offers opportunities for the 7 Habits essential to Leader in Me to be carried over into the homes of our students. Families who choose to participate are acknowledged as Lighthouse Families. Deer Point has a Student Lighthouse Team that helps to drive decisions regarding school culture. Every class begins the day with a morning meeting and focuses on social emotional goals and community building. Each month Deer Point holds Anglers in Action during the school day. During this time all staff and students participate in a group activity that is of high interest to them. Groups such as technology, animals, drawing, and crafts. Each group will also choose a community outreach to participate in. Girls on the Run will be available to our students. The mental health triad is available to support students in skills groups, support teachers with classroom management strategies, and implement de-escalation strategies when students are overwhelmed.

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

Administrators - oversee the implementation of Leader in Me and the components associated with the program.

Staff - teach the 7 Habits, facilitate morning meetings, seek support for students when early warning signs are noticed. Maintain ongoing and open communication with student families.

Students - Participate in the 7 Habits and classroom/school activities related to this program.

Families - Participate in the 7 Habits home/school connection activities. Maintain ongoing and open communication with teachers and other applicable school staff.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>