Bay District Schools

Palm Bay Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Down and Onether of the OID	4
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Palm Bay Elementary School

1104 BALBOA AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

www.palmbayelementary.org

Demographics

Principal: Patty Phillips

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 (45%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	ormation*
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo	or 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Palm Bay Elementary School

1104 BALBOA AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

www.palmbayelementary.org

School Demographics

School Type and Gi (per MSID		2020-21 Title I School	Disadvan	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S KG-5	School	Yes		100%
Primary Servio (per MSID I	• •	Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	Yes		50%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		С	С	В

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.

The vision of Palm Bay Elementary School is to improve the lives of our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The mission of Palm Bay Elementary School is to provide authentic learning experiences, a collaborative nurturing environment, and build a foundation for student success through the use of technology and social/emotional supports.

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
Phillips, Patty	Principal	Shaping a vision of academic success for all students. Creating a positive school culture and climate. Cultivating leadership in others. Improving instruction. Managing people, data and processes to foster academic student success and school improvement.
Clark, Heather	Assistant Principal	Monitor the implementation and progress of academic, behavior, and emotional learning of our learners. Facilitate conversations about data, curriculum, content, engagement, and provide professional development to best meet the needs of all learners.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Patty Phillips

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.

n

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

16

Total number of students enrolled at the school

282

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

lu dia stau	Grade Level													Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	54	53	50	48	44	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	281
Attendance below 90 percent	15	9	6	8	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	6	5	13	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	vel	l				Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/29/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator Grade Level Total

Number of students enrolled

Attendance below 90 percent

One or more suspensions

Course failure in ELA

Course failure in Math

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment

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

Indicator Grade Level Total

Students with two or more indicators

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator Grade Level Total

Retained Students: Current Year

Students retained two or more times

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator		Grade Level												Total
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
Number of students enrolled	55	54	55	51	41	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	302
Attendance below 90 percent	8	7	8	8	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	4	2	4	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator		Grade Level													
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	3	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State		
ELA Achievement				53%	55%	57%	51%	50%	56%		
ELA Learning Gains				51%	59%	58%	56%	49%	55%		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	57%	53%	56%	45%	48%		
Math Achievement				54%	56%	63%	60%	57%	62%		
Math Learning Gains				45%	54%	62%	58%	57%	59%		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	42%	51%	50%	46%	47%		
Science Achievement				26%	53%	53%	55%	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	67%	61%	6%	58%	9%
Cohort Cor	nparison					
04	2021					
	2019	53%	58%	-5%	58%	-5%
Cohort Cor	nparison	-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	56%	-19%	56%	-19%
Cohort Cor	nparison	-53%			•	

	MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison		
03	2021							
	2019	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%		
Cohort Cor	Cohort Comparison							
04	2021					_		
	2019	64%	59%	5%	64%	0%		

	MATH								
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison			
Cohort Co	Cohort Comparison								
05	2021								
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	60%	-21%			
Cohort Co	mparison	-64%			•				

			SCIEN	CE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	30%	54%	-24%	53%	-23%
Cohort Con	Cohort Comparison					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready diagnostic data

		Grade 1		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 2		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
		Grade 3		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged			
7.110	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
7.110	Disabilities English Language	Fall	Winter	Spring

		Grade 4		
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	Fall	Winter	Spring
		Grade 5		
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMP	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	40			21							
ELL											
BLK	30			48							
HSP	56			63							
MUL	33			43							
WHT	67	52		61	44		24				
FRL	44	52		53	48		9				
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMP	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	27	36		47	45						
BLK	35	58		31	45						
HSP	53	46		47	46						
MUL	46			50							
WHT	59	51		62	49		30				
FRL	53	47	57	53	47	33	16				
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMP	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	13	45		41	33						
BLK	39	42		44	25						
HSP	43	55		57	64						
MUL	36			55							
WHT	59	60		66	69		60				
FRL	44	52	53	59	51	45	56				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	350
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	40
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	39
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	53
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	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	41
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?

State assessment data shows the following;

- 1. Decrease in 3rd grade Math proficiency (60% to 45%)
- 2. Decrease in 3rd grade ELA proficiency (67% to 47%)
- 3. Decrease in 5th grade ELA LG (
- 3. No significant change in 5th grade Science proficiency (30% to 29%)
- 4. Decrease in ELA and Math proficiency in Black students from 2018-2019 state assessments.

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

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

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

Based on state assessments from 2019 to 2021:

- 1. Increase in 4th grade ELA proficiency (53% to 62%)
- 2. Increase in 4th grade Math proficiency (64% to 80%)
- 3. Increase in 5th grade ELA proficiency (39% to 50%)
- 4. Increase in 5th grade Math proficiency (37% to 55%)

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

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

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Our school is not listed on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org site.

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.

Our school expectations along with a rubric for each expectation and campus location are posted in each classroom and common areas. Following the expectations of:

- 1. Practice kindness.
- 2. Act responsibly.
- 3. Work with integrity.
- 4. Show respect (PAWS)

is living "The Panther Way"

Our staff has been trained in the Responsive Classroom approach and implements the a student-centered,

social and emotional learning approach to teaching and discipline. 20-30 minutes in the morning is designated for Morning Meeting each day.

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

Classroom teachers - facilitates Morning Meetings each day; incorporates Responsive Classroom strategies during classroom instruction and activities.

Administrators -

Part V: Budget

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

