Lucille Moore Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lucille Moore Elementary School

1900 MICHIGAN AVE, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christina Bordelon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: D (33%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lucille Moore Elementary School

1900 MICHIGAN AVE, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 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	75%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will prepare all students for college and life by providing a challenging curriculum that is relevant to our students lives and their future in a safe, supportive, and nurturing environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to make a positive difference.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bordelon, Christina	Principal	
Harrington, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Vines, Kathy	Assistant Principal	
Davis, Kevin	Other	
Gaddy, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Frigon, Tracy	Instructional Media	
Pickrell, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	
Ngo, Diem	Teacher, K-12	
Yager, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	
Webb, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	
Siegal, Miriam	Teacher, K-12	
Wielenga, Crystal	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Christina Bordelon

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

476

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

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	70	77	95	99	62	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	476
Attendance below 90 percent	20	21	19	23	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	1	24	15	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	15	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	7	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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	70	85	67	72	75	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	29	35	29	28	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	6	1	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	4	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	33	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	44	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	13	7	8	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	3	6	4	4	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	70	85	67	72	75	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	29	35	29	28	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	6	1	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	4	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	33	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	44	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	13	7	8	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	3	6	4	4	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	31%	51%	56%				38%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	38%						56%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	24%						65%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	34%	48%	50%				41%	56%	63%
Math Learning Gains	40%						52%	54%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						56%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	50%	59%				37%	53%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	39%	61%	-22%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	58%	-14%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					
	2019	30%	56%	-26%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	59%	-13%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					
	2019	23%	54%	-31%	60%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	53%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	8	22	13	20	32	33	21				
ELL	24	34		28	47		13				
BLK	28	41		28	41		12				
HSP	33	40	18	36	43		25				
MUL	38			47							
WHT	28	27	25	35	39	38	45				
FRL	32	39	30	36	40	38	28				

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	31	35		28	18		45				
ELL	29	70		18	40						
BLK	35	31		22			45				
HSP	40	67		24	33		29				
MUL	31			38							
WHT	35	30		35	30		71				
FRL	37	48	70	29	22		48				

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	29	49	56	35	47	47	14				
ELL	19	57		35	48						
BLK	40	56	69	37	49	64	38				
HSP	25	58		36	48		30				
MUL	33			55							
WHT	48	59		43	63		44				
FRL	37	57	61	42	54	58	39				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	43
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	34
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

A school-wide trend that emerged across all grade levels was the number of students who scored on grade level in Mathematics. The data from the 2022 state assessment showed that all students increased by a 5% compared to the previous year . In the subgroup for Math Learning Gains for 4th and 5th grade, and the lowest 25% , there was a 17 % increase and a 18% increase. Based on I-ready data students in Kindergarten, 1st, and 2nd grades also saw an increase in the number of students who scored on grade level in mathematics from the fall progress monitoring to the spring.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The school-wide data component with the greatest decline from the 2021 school year to the 2022 school year is the lowest 25% in ELA, as all subgroups saw a decline in achievement.

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

The contributing factor would be student absenteeism, increase in ELL population, and transient population.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The school-wide component that showed the most improvement is the Math. The lowest 25th Percentile showed growth with an increase of 18% in proficiency.
.

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

Focusing on the academic needs of the students has allowed us to provide specific instruction that assisted in closing the gap.

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

The strategies that will be used accelerated learning include, small group instruction during the 90 minute reading block with on station focusing on grade level standards that the students data has indicated they need remediation or enrichment. The other station will be with a paraprofessional or academic interventionist that is working on the HMH table top lessons or writers workshop. An additional hour of reading intervention and enrichment has been added to all students schedule. This time will be used to provide intervention for all students on their instructional level based on I-ready data. Each student will work in small group with their teacher for differentiated instruction to help fill in an gaps to help students achieve the goal of reading on grade-level. All teachers will be provide with extra support during this time so students will have three rotations and work with two adults on specific skills. The lesson will be from I-ready. PLCs will meet the first Tuesday of every month to review the I-ready data and discuss student placement and move them based on their induvial data and learning path. This will help keep groups fluid and ensure that students are getting the instruction they need.

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.

I-ready Training
Professional Development from PAEC on a multitude of focus areas based on the data
HMH training
New teacher training delivered by the Academic and Behavior interventionist
FAST training
Weekly PLC Meetings

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

LMES will continue with an additional hour of reading as well as small group instruction, that is differentiated for all students based on their needs. We will also continue to provide professional development based off student data to help support our teachers and staff. The students needs will continue to drive instruction.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Focusing on interventions and enrichment based on students' needs will increase the number of students who achieve learning gains. Increasing the students making learning gains will therefore increase our number of student performing on grade-level in ELA, math, and science.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains from 38% to 61% Increase the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gain in math from 40 to 61%. Increase the number of students making learning gains overall in ELA from 38% to 61%. Increase the number of students making learning gains overall in math from 34% to 61%. With these learning gain projected we will increase the number of students performing on grade-level in the are of ELA from 31% to 61% and in area of math from 34% to 50%. Increase the ESSA number of ESE students from 40% to 43% The number of students performing on grade level in Kindergarten and first grade will increase to 75% This intended outcome will allow the overall growth to increase from 33% to 61% (5%), raising our school grade from a D to an A!
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. PLCs will be monitored to ensure each meeting addresses the academic needs through PLC agenda and administration attendance. 2. PD will be provided to teachers that need support and guidance to understand student data to adjust their instruction and differienation on the academic needs. 3. MTSS will be monitored and analyzed, allowing us to support the school's academic program through strategic and flexible focus. 4. Data Chat meetings (to include an school based academic leaders) evaluate the needs of the students to refine, monitor and/or develop a plan to address the needs. 5. Dedicated Intervention/Enrichment time with strategic and flexible small group instruction with approved research based curriculum monitored through the use of Intervention/Enrichment notebook. 6. Data sheet monitored and revised monthly to track student's progress to adjust small groups and ensure all students needs are being met and we are closing the gaps.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Bordelon (bordecl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Collaboration and Professional Development with instructional coaches and instructional specialist provides teachers the support and guidance needs to understand student data and base instruction and intervention on the needs of the students. Simplified and just in time MTSS allows us to strengthen and support the school's academic program through strategic focus. Dedicated Intervention/Enrichment Time: Intervention Fidelity, Fluidity, Accountability, and Monitoring is the

expectation. Each teacher will document Intervention/Enrichment data on students.
Also, within the master schedule, students have a specific Math as well AS ELA time to provide intervention and enrichment to all students at Lucille Moore.

1. Effective PLCs, includes all school based stakeholders
2. Collaboration and Professional Development based on teacher's needs
3. Simplified MTSS
$. Dedicated Intervention and Enrichment time, ensuring ESE students, ELL students, the students below grade level, the lowest 25%, and students above grade levels academic needs are met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1.Teachers meet at least once as week to prepare and plan for standards based instruction. They will review student data and discuss the implementation of effective instruction and invention strategies based on the needs of students as demonstrated on the data shared.
2.The collaboration with district coaches and instructional specialist will ensure that instruction meets the intended rigor of the standards and intervention is based on the academic needs of the students.
3. Monthly Data chat meetings with all teachers in grade level PLCs, instructional coaches,
support team members (to include MTSS Interventionist- School and District Level, School
of Hope Team Members) and administration will discuss the needs of the students and develop a plan to address the needs.
4. Intervention Fidelity, Fluidity, Accountability, Monitoring. Within the master schedule, students have a specific Math as well AS ELA time for providing intervention and enrichment to all students at Lucille Moore.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to behavior	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Lucille Moore will continue to perfect the 15 minute implementation of character education daily and the positive incentives to continue the decrease in the number of discipline referral by 5%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Effective instruction in character education will led to a decrease of discipline incidents by 5%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This data will be discussed monthly at the Special Area and MTSS PLC, at monthly C.A.R.E. meetings, by the ISS and Promise room spreadsheets, and by reviewing monthly reports from FOCUS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Bordelon (bordecl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1.Core Essentials is the school-wide character development curriculum. 2. Positive behavior will be celebrated monthly with the Phenomenal Patriot pep rally. 3.Class DOJO is the school-wide positive behavior management system. 4. Provide wrap around services for Patriots to keep them in the classroom in order to regain instructional time. 5. Increase parent involvement by hosting multiple family nights that incorporate an academic focus and a positive school culture.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Through the implementation of these strategies in the 2021-2022 school year and the refinement of these strategies for the 22-23 school year, we will decrease the discipline referrals. This will allow our students to increase their time in the classroom therefore increasing the postive classroom environments that wil lead to increasing the academic success of all students.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on I-ready Progress Monitoring Data available for the 21-22 school year, 83% of our kindergarten students were reading on grade-level by the end of the year. Additionally, 36% percent of our 1st grade students and 27% of our second grade were reading on grade level , based off the I-Ready Spring Progress Monitoring. There was not a decrease in the percent of students progressing towards reading on grade-level.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the data from the 21-22 Florida Standards Assessment, 31% of students in grades 3-5th achieved a level 3 or higher in ELA. In 3rd grade, 33% of students scored a 3 or higher. Additionally 27 % of our 4th grade students and 31% of our 5th grade students earned a score of 3 or higher. The level of students achieving a 3 or above fell from 33% to 47% in 4th grade, yet in 3rd grade the percent of students reading on grade level increased from 19% to 33%. Students in the 5th grade reading on grade-level also improved from 28% to 31%.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the Progress Monitoring data from last year, 100% of all students in grade K-2 will be reading on grade-level by the end of the 22-23 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the Progress Monitoring data from last year, 61% of a students in grade 3-5 will be reading on grade-level by the end of the 22-23 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The implementation of the newly aligned Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, into the ELA core curriculum includes lessons rooted in the BEST Standards and includes engaging strategies such as gradual release, the small group targeted instruction using grade level materials, writers workshop, and independent practice. We will also continue to provide an extra hour of reading intervention and enrichment, in addition to the 90 minute ELA block. Students will work in small groups and instruction will be based on their specific needs as identified by I-Ready and their individual learning paths. This will allow timely intervention, Fluidity of groups. A
Universal Spreadsheet will be used for each grade-level, each teacher will keep an I-ready data notebook on students in I-ready which includes those below grade level. The first Tuesday of every month during PLCS, will be dedicated to reviewing this data and moving students as they make progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bordelon, Christina, bordecl@bay.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Lucille Moore will utilize , Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, which is aligned with the FL BEST Standards. HMN 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. 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. Students will be assigned individualized lessons to address learning deficits and provide instruction on pre-requisite skills necessary to master grade-level standards.

.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

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:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
All new teachers will be provided the opportunity to participate in HMH training . Additionally, returning staff will receive targeted professional development facilitated by instructional specialist, that focused on their students specific needs. These trainings will guide teachers in the implementation of the standards based curriculum.Our instructional specialist will work with grade level PLCs as they plan instruction, monitor student performance, and provide targeted interventions.	
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 instruction aligned to schools learning goals.	Bordelon, Christina, bordecl@bay.k12.fl.us
Diagnostic assessments will be ongoing in order to identify students specific needs LMES utilizes the Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan and MTSS decision tree which indicates research based and evidence-based materials available for targeted intervention. If student data does not show progress at Tier 2 then adjustments will be made.	

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Lucille Moore Elementary strives to provide a culture of acceptance and infinite possibility. Not only to we make every effort to meet the academic success of our students, we do our best to ensure students and families have the tools and necessities to address their basic needs. We are able to accomplish a positive school culture and environment by consulting with various stakeholders. Working in partnership with educational institutions, businesses, local governments, school board members, volunteers, mentors, and social services we are able to offer our teachers, students and families additional resources that they need to be successful!
-Inviting school board members to participate in back to school events opens the door for those members to understand the dynamics of the school therefore lending itself to make better informed decisions.
-Collaboration with Panama City, City Council on a partnership with students and the city to educate students on city government and expose students to live sessions of the government in action.
-Elevate Bay mentors invest, support, and partner with several students and classrooms to encourage and motivate students to maximize their potential.
-Various Church partnerships- campus beautification, donations of food, clothes and shoe.
-Gulf Coast College partnership to expose students to different forms of music and educate elementary students with music opportunities in college.
-FSU partnership math event to assist in creating a culture where students love math.
-Inviting Social Services to school events allows them to offers additional student and family educational opportunities and supplemental resources for families.

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

The stakeholders are teachers, staff, students, and community members. It is very important to us as a school to promote and model positive, appropriate behavior with our students and staff. Our students follow the schoolwide expectations. We recite the "Patriot Pledge" every morning on announcements, and each classroom has schoolwide expectations and classroom expectations displayed in their classroom. We communicate our schoolwide expectations with our stakeholders outside of school as well because it is important for them to be privy to our expectations and intent for promoting positive behavior.