

Bay District Schools

# Waller Elementary School



## 2022-23 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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Waller Elementary School

11332 E HIGHWAY 388, Youngstown, FL 32466

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Gina McNally**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2022

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: D (40%)<br>2018-19: C (46%)<br>2017-18: D (36%)  |
| <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>  | N/A   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  | N/A   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CSI   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Waller Elementary School

11332 E HIGHWAY 388, Youngstown, FL 32466

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 13%  |

## 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.

Mission Statement: Waller is a B.E.E. Kind school by Bringing Enlightenment through Empowerment.  
BRING: What knowledge will I bring to improve myself? How can I influence others in a positive way?  
ENLIGHTENMENT: I will be the "LIGHT" and lead with respect and responsibility for myself.  
EMPOWERMENT: I have the power to be better for myself and others through my thoughts and actions.

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

Vision of Waller Elementary:

To ensure students have a positive learning environment by creating a culture of kindness that fosters a community of lifelong learners. Our vision is to ensure that 100% of all Waller students will show 1 year worth of growth in all subjects (Reading, Math, Science), based on iReady progress monitoring assessments, and FAST/STAR progress monitoring assessment.

### 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   |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| McNally, Gina    | Principal           | oversee day-to-day operations of the school, serve as an instructional leader, manage school logistics and budgets, monitor student growth and performance, adjust supports and services based on student needs, monitor teacher performance and provide guidance and support, ensure that the campus is safe and secure, build productive relationships with families, community members and other stakeholders  |
| Davis, Josephine | Assistant Principal | Assists the principal in the overall administration of the school and assumes leadership of the school in the absence of the principal, serves as an Instructional Leader; facilitates the work of PLCs, leads data driven discussions and planning, relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy  |
| Iler, Jonathan   | Teacher, K-12       | STEAM Teacher<br>Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data  |
| Hawkins, Jaelin  | Teacher, K-12       | 2nd Grade Teacher<br>Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data  |
| Oleck, Jeffrey   | School Counselor    | School Guidance Counselor<br>Consults, facilitates, and maintains communication with parents, teachers, administrators, and pertinent agents on specific student and parent academic and educational matters including academic modifications and/or accommodations, provides counseling to address social and emotional concerns and appropriately refers students to behavioral health specialists, communicates, coordinates, and collaborates with school staff in developing and implementing student supports |
| Newsom, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12       | Grades 3-5 Interventionist<br>Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data   |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 8/19/2022, Gina McNally

**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.*

3

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

24

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

431

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

2

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

7

**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                              | 67          | 57 | 61 | 63 | 52 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 347   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 13          | 17 | 14 | 23 | 13 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 87    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 10          | 16 | 14 | 20 | 9  | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 87    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 7  | 11 | 7  | 2  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 2  | 7  | 4  | 2  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 5           | 14 | 15 | 8  | 3  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |

**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 | 4           | 13 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |

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     | 3           | 3 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| 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

Friday 8/19/2022

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                              | 66          | 58 | 62 | 65 | 51 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 352   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 12          | 18 | 13 | 23 | 12 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 87    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 3  | 5  | 6  | 1  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 3  | 3  | 3  | 0  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 9  | 6  | 5  | 8  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |

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

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

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     | 0           | 7 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

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                              | 66          | 58 | 62 | 65 | 51 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 352   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 12          | 18 | 13 | 23 | 12 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 87    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 3  | 5  | 6  | 1  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 3  | 3  | 3  | 0  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 9  | 6  | 5  | 8  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |

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

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

**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     | 0           | 7 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| 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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 41%    | 51%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 42%    | 55%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 54%    |          |       |        |          |       | 56%    | 59%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 38%    |          |       |        |          |       | 68%    | 57%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 40%    | 48%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 35%    | 56%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 42%    |          |       |        |          |       | 46%    | 54%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 21%    |          |       |        |          |       | 41%    | 42%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 41%    | 50%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 35%    | 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 | 53%    | 61%      | -8%                        | 58%   | -5%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 38%    | 58%      | -20%                       | 58%   | -20%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -53%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 36%    | 56%      | -20%                       | 56%   | -20%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -38%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 41%    | 62%      | -21%                       | 62%   | -21%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 59%      | -18%                       | 64%   | -23%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -41%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 29%    | 54%      | -25%                       | 60%   | -31%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -41%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 34%    | 54%      | -20%                       | 53%   | -19%                    |
| 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                                       | 16       | 50     | 30          | 21        | 26      | 13           | 13       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 36       |        |             | 27        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 40       | 52     | 39          | 40        | 41      | 22           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 39       | 48     | 32          | 36        | 36      | 15           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 16       | 21     | 8           | 27        | 26      |              | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 18       |        |             | 36        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 39       | 38     | 20          | 43        | 48      | 27           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 33       | 39     | 17          | 40        | 46      | 36           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 26       | 50     | 57          | 19        | 45      | 50           | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 42       | 56     | 68          | 35        | 46      | 43           | 34       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 44       | 56     | 63          | 35        | 48      | 44           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 40  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 4   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 277 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 24  |
| 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                                      |     |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| 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                                |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 32  |
| 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   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| 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%       | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 40  |
| 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                                | 36  |
| 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?

Academic Analysis-. In reviewing the FSA ELA data 41% of students in the third grade demonstrated proficiency, 31% of students in fourth grade demonstrated proficiency, and 41% of fifth grade students demonstrated proficiency.

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

Based on the FSA data and iReady Diagnostic Assessment the greatest areas of need are in the areas of 4th grade proficiency for reading (31% proficient) and fifth grade math (33% proficient). Additionally, our focus will also be to ensure that our ESSA subgroups receive targeted instruction and interventions with a focus on our Students with Disabilities. Our data also indicates that there was significant loss of learning associated with exclusionary disciplinary actions.

#### 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 primary contributing factors include two years of lost instruction due to the pandemic, student absences, and natural disasters in the area.

This will be addressed by providing campus based reading and science coaches that can support teachers with curriculum and instructional strategies. Administrators will work closely with instructional staff to ensure that they feel supported and valued and will respond to the needs as they arise. Additionally, a school based Program Specialist will be working closely with PLCs to ensure that standards based instruction and targeted interventions are being provided with fidelity across the campus.

Moreover, the role of the school wide interventionist will include progress monitoring, data chats, and specific, targeted instruction for all students across all grade levels in reading and math.

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

Based on iReady Diagnostic progress monitoring data we saw tremendous growth in our primary grade levels. At the beginning of the school year 12% of Kindergarten students measured at grade level in reading. On the final iReady Diagnostic 42% of students were on or above grade level. On the first diagnostic 1% of 1st graders demonstrated proficiency and on the final diagnostic 38% were proficient. Additionally, at the start of the school year 15% of second grade students demonstrated grade-level proficiency. On the final diagnostic assessment 24% of students demonstrated proficiency. Grade 3 BOY Reading proficiency was 36% and EOY Reading Proficiency was 37%. Grade 4 BOY proficiency was

22% and EOY Reading proficiency as 33%. Grade 5 BOY Reading proficiency was 14% and EOY Reading proficiency was 11%.

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

During the 21-22 school year Waller added a 2nd interventionist to serve students in grades K through 2. Additional support was provided to the primary grade levels through increased para support during core instruction. Teachers were provided with supports from the district literacy coach that was assigned to the school 2 days a week. For the 22-23 school year the additional para support was extended to the intermediate grade levels. In addition, a literacy coach and a math coach dedicated to the school will collaborate with all instructional staff.

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

The school's instructional minutes will be increased daily. This additional time will allow for 90 minutes of core grade-level instruction along with an additional 60 minutes of intervention/acceleration. This additional time will be spent addressing the individual needs of each learner. will provide opportunities throughout the school day for small group targeted interventions. Additional support will be provided by pushing in Para support during core content instruction.

In order to better address the ESSA sub-groups needs, an additional interventionist will be added to support the identified students in their general education classroom. This teacher will provide small group interventions and supports during core instruction. Student progress will be closely monitored using both formative and summative assessments. Data from these assessments will be reviewed during regularly scheduled grade-level data chats. The bi-weekly data chats will include close monitoring of each of the ESSA subgroups. Supports and Interventions will be adjusted to address the needs of each subgroup.

The master schedule reflects 20 minute intervention/acceleration at the end of the day for all students. All students are receiving SMALL GROUP instruction during that time frame.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

The district level Instructional Specialist will provide ongoing, job-embedded professional learning to leaders and teachers on the mechanical use of the district adopted curriculum, standards based lesson planning expectations, engaging instructional practices and strategies, data analysis and planning for interventions and roles and responsibilities of grade-level PLCs.

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

Targeted support will be provided in order to accelerate the learning through targeted, individualized instruction. The students of Bay District schools have experienced extensive hardships as we continue to re-build through a global pandemic following category 5 Hurricane Michael. Students have significant unfinished learning due to these circumstances. The support and resources that will be provided will enable our students to master prerequisite skills as they continue to learn grade-level concepts and standards. As the students' achievement gaps close, additional resources and support will be faded. Bay District schools will continue to provide Tiered supports and services based on school and student needs. Our Assessment and Accountability Department works closely with our Curriculum and Instruction Department to ensure that student progress across the district is closely monitored. As learning gaps are identified the district and school based teams will work collaboratively to ensure that students and staff are receiving the support necessary to successfully demonstrate mastery of the standards. These supports will include district based academic coaches, new teacher coaches and

support, school based literacy coaches, school based interventionists, on-going professional development and targeted individualized interventions as needed.

### **Areas of Focus**

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

:



## #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Data concludes that the students with disabilities sub-group from Waller Elementary is, on average, 16% less proficient than students based on the federal index. (Waller 24% proficient, Federal 40% proficient)

**Measurable Outcome:**  
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The outcome the school plans to achieve is to decrease the average gap between groups by 6%.

Providing quality instruction, focused support, and resources are key for bridging the gap between the two groups. This also includes monitoring the following:

**Monitoring:**  
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Intensive, focused and fluid small group intervention
2. Holding students to high expectations, Important Goals I Can Achieve (IGICA and PBIS)
3. Student access to books, tutoring, and, mental health
4. School wide mentoring
5. Monthly data chats and assessment analysis
6. Weekly discussions within the PLC documenting instructional strategies that “work”, and making changes to instructional practices that do not meet student learning needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Newsom (newsomjd@bay.k12.fl.us)

Data based instruction is the key strategy that will be implemented for this particular Area of Focus. This will include the following individual strategies:

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. PLC discussions and implementations of new/different instructional strategies to promote greater student learning
2. Creating student goals based on i-ready, FAST, and STAR
3. Implementation of a clear, consistent, and positive school-wide behavior plan, Be Kind Project

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

The rationale involved with selecting this strategy comes from the idea that students with disabilities need quality instruction, structure, goals, and extra support to help them succeed.

### 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.

1. Teachers must follow the Master Schedule for delivering focused interventions daily
2. Teachers must identify student’s academic needs for intervention
3. Teachers and students together identify student’s IGICA (Important Goals I can Achieve)
4. Teachers and students follow the PBIS plan using the Be Kind People Project
5. Administration will work with the Professional Learning Communities to ensure the master schedule allows for time in small group throughout the day.

6. Administration will provide feedback and support to all classroom teachers while conducting classroom walk throughs. The data from classroom walkthroughs will be used to target areas of improvement.
7. Lesson plan development and teacher records of small group instruction and grouping will be reviewed weekly during the PLC.
8. Interventionists and classroom teachers will progress monitor student achievement and provide real time feedback to students and parents.
9. The PLC will use the four critical questions to guide the PLC in decision making. The PLC will be diligent in defining the critical issues for team consideration during each weekly planning time.

**Person Responsible**

Gina McNally (mcnalg1@bay.k12.fl.us)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Area of Focus</b><br><b>Description and Rationale:</b><br><b>Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</b> | <p>Waller Elementary will increase student proficiency levels in the area of Reading and Math by identifying specific student needs and deficits and using appropriate data to plan and provide interventions and instruction. Rationale focusing on student needs will allow students to gain proficiency in Reading and Math. Small group instruction provides teachers opportunity to teach skill deficits at students individual level. Data shows that students working in small group with explicit instruction at the student level significantly increases student growth toward mastery.</p> |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b><br><b>State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.</b><br><b>This should be a data based, objective outcome.</b>      | <p>Waller Elementary students will increase in reading proficiency to at least 50% achieving proficiency level or above, as measured by Spring F.A.S.T. for grades 3-5 and district assessment for K-2. Waller teachers and staff will ensure that 100% of all students will show 1-year worth of growth based on iReady assessment data.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I- Ready - 2021-2022</li> <li>2. FSA (subcategories)- previous years data</li> </ol>  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b><br><b>Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</b>  | <p>Small group instructional groups will provide data for progress monitoring</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HMH BOY Assessment</li> <li>2. I-Ready Data</li> <li>3. F.A.S.T. PM 2 and PM 3</li> <li>4. Bay Literature Resources</li> <li>5. FCRR Supplemental Curriculum</li> <li>6. Weekly HMH Assessments</li> <li>7. District Common Assessments - the end of module assessments</li> <li>8. Admin walk throughs (*daily with feedback and support)</li> <li>9. MTSS Data Chats and progress monitoring</li> <li>10. PLC Data Chats and progress monitoring</li> </ol>             |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>  | <p>Gina McNally (mcnalg1@bay.k12.fl.us)</p>   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b><br><b>Describe the evidence-based strategy</b>   | <p>The main evidence-based strategy students will engage in is flexible grouping in a small group setting. Other strategies in place to support this strategy are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Flexible Grouping - Teachers will use I-ready data and other data for flexible grouping of students in small groups.</li> <li>2. I-Ready</li> <li>3. Research-based interventions-HMH (provided by K-2 and 3-5 Intervention teachers)</li> </ol> <p>* Phonemic Awareness K-2nd</p>  |

**being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

- \* HMH lessons for 1st-5th
- 4. District Pacing Guide - HMH- Small Group Lessons
- 5. Complex Texts - readworks.org
- 6. FCRR Supplemental Resource
- 7. Professional lesson planning protocol as needed for professional development.
- 8. Interventionists targeting Tier 2 and Tier 3 students (one for grades K-2 and one for grades 3-5)
- 9. District Reading Coach integrated throughout PLC meetings
- 10. Whole Brain Teaching

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

Research supports the positive outcomes that small group instruction has on reading achievement and future success in school. Also, this is a strategy supported by our district and our state. Resources being used are district personnel, research-based curriculum, research-based technology and research-based strategies (see above). Small group instruction benefits subgroups of students such as students in Tier II and Tier III, in the ESOL program and in the ESE program. In addition, on level students and high-achieving students individual needs are met to increase reading skills. Implementation of WHOLE BRAIN TEACHING. Whole brain teaching is a set of strategies that combines the best attributes of Direct Instruction and Cooperative learning to create an engaging classroom environment for students. Direct instruction includes clear goals, structured time, and immediate academic feedback to students. Cooperative learning involves student interaction as the basis for learning to problem solve together, discuss ideas, and practice.

#### **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.

1. Administration will work with the Professional Learning Communities to ensure the master schedule allows for time in small group throughout the day.
2. Administration will provide feedback and support to all classroom teachers while conducting classroom walk throughs. The data from classroom walkthroughs will be used to target areas of improvement.
3. Lesson plan development and teacher records of small group instruction and grouping will be reviewed weekly during the PLC.
4. Interventionists and classroom teachers will progress monitor student achievement and provide real time feedback to students and parents.
5. The PLC will use the four critical questions to guide the PLC in decision making. The PLC will be diligent in defining the critical issues for team consideration during each weekly planning time.

**Person Responsible** Gina McNally (mcnalg1@bay.k12.fl.us)

### #3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Behavior and Mental Health Supports

#### Area of Focus

**Description and Rationale:** For the 22-23 school year our focus will be to continue to build a positive school culture through implementation of our Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program utilizing the Be Kind People Project and the Waller House System for enhanced character development.

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** Our 2022 behavior data shows that there were 467 discipline referrals written during the 21-22 school year. Of those, 171 referrals were written for Inappropriate Behavior/ Language. Additionally, there were 94 discipline referrals written for Fighting and/or Physical Attack. The discipline referrals resulted in a total of 204 days of In-School Suspension and 102 days of Out of School Suspension. Reducing this significant loss of instructional time will be the primary Area of Focus for the 22-23 school year.

#### Measurable Outcome:

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

We will reduce the number of suspensions, both Out of School and In School, in order to increase the number of hours students are receiving direct instruction in the classroom. Our discipline data will show at least a 10% reduction in suspensions at the end of the 22-23 school year.

**Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Discipline data is reviewed and discussed as part of the weekly behavior monitoring and monthly data chats. The number of students with discipline referrals, types of infractions and number of suspension days are evaluated and discussed at these meetings to determine the need for additional behavioral and mental health supports.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Josephine Davis (davisje@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Implementation of a Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) system has been proven to improve student outcomes, reduce exclusionary discipline, build a positive school climate, and Improve teacher outcomes. The Be Kind People Project and the Waller House System offers experiences and project-based learning for students to be equipped with a solid framework for decision-making and taking accountability for building respectful interpersonal relationship skills, improving behaviors, and forming enduring values.

**Rationale for Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**  
**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

PBIS is a framework for creating safe, positive, equitable schools, where every student can feel valued, connected to the school community and supported by caring adults. By implementing evidence-based practices within a PBIS framework, schools support their students' academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success, engage with families to create locally-meaningful and culturally-relevant outcomes, and use data to make informed decisions that improve the way things work for everyone. Implementing the Be Kind People Project and the Waller House system will students to put their feelings into words and develop community among one another to encourage success with behaviors.

**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.

1. Implementation and support of Waller Elementary School's Mental Health Triad team. These 2 individuals will be providing support for behavior and student mental health daily. Use of Masters and Licensed level personnel to support students within the classroom setting and small group where appropriate.
2. Use of Promise Room and Calm Down space within the classrooms are additional layers of support. Promise Room supports include appropriate use of the Calm Down space within the classrooms, physical breaks within the Promise Room.
2. House System and celebrations for positive behavior successes.
3. Use of brain research strategies to support Whole Brain teaching for improved student engagement.
4. Monthly meeting of Threat Assessment Team and MTSS Leadership to discuss students with behavioral concerns.
5. Weekly review of referrals to increase behavioral and mental health supports.
6. Community and school-based mentoring program to support students in need.

**Person Responsible** Josephine Davis (davisje@bay.k12.fl.us)

**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 the Spring iReady Diagnostic Assessment, 42% of Kindergarten students met grade-level expectations. This was a dramatic increase from the 12% of Kindergarten students that showed proficiency at the beginning of the school year. 38% of First Grade students demonstrated proficiency on the Spring iReady Diagnostic Assessment and 24% of Second Grade students demonstrated proficiency.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA ELA data, 59% of students in the third grade are performing below grade-level, 69% of students in fourth grade are performing below grade level and 59% of students in fifth grade are performing below grade level.

### 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)

At the end of the 22-23 school year K-2 students will participate in the 2023 Spring Florida Progress Monitoring FAST-STAR Assessments, and at least 55% of the students in K-2 will demonstrate grade-level proficiency.

### Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

At the end of the 22-23 school year 3rd-5th students will participate in the 2023 Spring Florida Progress Monitoring FAST-STAR Assessments at least 55% of the students in 3-5 will demonstrate grade-level proficiency.



### **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.

Student progress will be monitored through standards based formative and summative assessments, iReady Diagnostic Assessments, and the Florida Progress Monitoring FAST Assessments, STAR Assessments. Grade level PLCs along with school-level interventionist, coaches and administration will conduct monthly data chats to review data and ongoing progress related to TIER I instruction along with student progress receiving TIER I and TIER III interventions.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McNally, Gina, mcnalgl1@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. Â§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?

Bay County has adopted 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. Additionally, 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, student's progress will be monitored in i-Ready as well, with students participating in Fall, Winter, and Spring diagnostic assessments, identifying students in need of additional support and intervention via individual lessons.

### **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 of .60 and scaffolding effect 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 Houghton Mifflin Harcourt training through HMH professional development opportunities. In addition, returning staff will receive targeted professional development facilitated by contracted ELA Instructional Specialists. This series of training will guide teachers in the implementation of the standards based curriculum. Our Literacy Regional Director will also provide professional development and resources to address particular areas of need based on progress monitoring data.

McNally, Gina,  
mcnalg1@bay.k12.fl.us

Teachers will meet in PLC's to analyze formative and summative assessment data along with iReady diagnostic and growth monitoring data. Administrators will take part in these PLC meetings to ensure that the curriculum is being instructed with fidelity and that students are receiving necessary support and interventions.

For any student who has not responded to a specific reading intervention delivered with fidelity and with the initial intensity provided, reading intervention instruction and/or materials may be changed based on student data. Diagnostic assessments will be required to identify specific needs like 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.

### 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.**

Waller Elementary has a positive school culture and is exemplified in its environment. Our mission is to develop the whole child by bringing enlightenment through empowerment. To address the whole child, we utilize resources at the school level and at the district level. School level services include the School Counselor, mental health counselors, triad team for student wellness, Promise paraprofessionals, and mentors.

Waller Elementary implements the Be Kind People Project to build character. We strive to teach our students the five components of positive character development.

1. Self-Awareness through positivity and honesty
2. Self-Management through thankfulness and consideration
3. Social Awareness through respect and helpfulness
4. Relationship Skills through friendship and supporting others
5. Responsible Decision-Making through responsibility and encouragement of others

Implementation of the HOUSE System: Each student is "sorted" into a leadership house in order to uplift and encourage students across grade levels both vertically and horizontally to lift up one another. The four leadership houses are: Honesty, Respect, Responsibility, and Courage.

Waller Elementary is also a part of the Each classroom is provided with calming resources to build a Peace Corner for students to have a "safe space" to cool down, reflect, gather their thoughts, and prepare for difficult tasks and transitions. The Trauma Sensitive Classroom Project also implements Mindful Moments for teachers and students to discuss strategies in self de-escalation and problem-solving. Whole Brain research has been implemented and will continue in order to assist students and staff in strengthening student engagement.

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

Gina McNally - Principal  
 JoBeth Davis - Assistant Principal  
 Jeffrey Oleck - School Counselor  
 Erin Bruner - Triad (Licensed Social Worker)  
 Judy Wade - Triad  
 Ivan Larriviere - School-based Social Worker  
 Patty Emfinger - Promise Paraprofessional  
 LaRonda Branch - Behavior Paraprofessional  
 All staff