Callaway Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Callaway Elementary School

7115 E HIGHWAY 22, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Good

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2022

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 (40%) 2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	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

Callaway Elementary School

7115 E HIGHWAY 22, Panama City, FL 32404

[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	59%

School Grades History

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

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 are cougars! We learn. We LEAD (love, empower, advocate, and dream). We provide a culture of engaging, ambitious instruction which promotes a community of lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

By the end of second grade, 100% of our scholars will be reading proficiently. When promoted to middle school, 100% of 5th grade scholars will be proficient in all subjects.

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
Good, Michelle	Principal	Oversees 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
Kirkpatrick, Heather	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
Blair, Shawna	Behavior Specialist	Responsible for assessing students with behavior issues, collecting data on the students, working with teachers, counselors and school psychologists to devise a behavior plan for the student and evaluating the effectiveness of the plan
Berry, Easton	School Counselor	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
Banks, Latonia	Math Coach	Model, coach, observe, and assist teachers in using research based math strategies to provide engaging instruction of the BEST Math Standards, coaching and modeling instructional and assessment strategies, and providing feedback that ensures effective instruction and student achievement
Schmidt, Dee	Reading Coach	Conducting on-site, on-going literacy- related professional development; modeling best practices; assisting teachers in analyzing student performance data for differentiated instruction; guiding teachers in planning ELA instruction using available research based resources and ensuring instruction is based on BEST Standards, and supporting school-wide progress monitoring programs

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/13/2022, Michelle Good

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

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

492

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

14

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

13

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	87	54	77	111	61	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	22	26	37	53	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184
One or more suspensions	3	1	10	25	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	0	0	8	21	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	11	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	6	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	8	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	0	8	31	9	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	4	0	3	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/22/2022

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	67	73	92	76	61	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436
Attendance below 90 percent	23	26	20	16	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	28	16	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	2	5	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	1	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	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	67	73	92	76	61	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436
Attendance below 90 percent	23	26	20	16	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	28	16	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	2	5	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	1	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	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	39%	51%	56%				36%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						40%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						38%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	37%	48%	50%				42%	56%	63%
Math Learning Gains	36%						45%	54%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						40%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	50%	59%				39%	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	46%	61%	-15%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	58%	-21%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					
	2019	30%	56%	-26%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

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	53%	62%	-9%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	59%	-16%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	53%	-14%
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	43	42	13	45	53	6				
ELL	21			29							
BLK	38	35		41	35		23				
HSP	41	38		39	31		46				
MUL	31	50		37	50		60				
WHT	41	57		35	33		31				
FRL	38	45	43	33	38	52	33				

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	17	25		22	25						
ELL	31			23							
BLK	28	38		32	23		20				
HSP	35			31							
MUL	25			46							
WHT	55	55		42	32		38				
FRL	42	43	36	37	30	40	29				

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	20	36	50	23	52	54					
ELL	30			50							
BLK	18	33		23	25						
HSP	50			43							
MUL	41	46		59	38						
WHT	39	39	33	48	51	31	48				
FRL	33	39	39	41	43	43	30				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	344
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
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	39
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	40
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- Based on the 2022 FSA data it is evident that the level of student proficiency in both reading and math decreases as students progress from 3rd through 5th grade. In reviewing the FSA ELA data 50% of students in the third grade demonstrated proficiency, 35% of fifth graders demonstrated proficiency. In the area of math, 54% of third grade students demonstrated proficiency on the 2022 FSA math, while 18% of students in the fifth grade demonstrated proficiency.
Additionally, ESSA subgroup data indicates that there is a significant discrepancy between school-wide proficiency and the proficiency of students with disabilities. The overall federal index shows that 43% of students demonstrated proficiency. However, 31% of students with disabilities demonstrated proficiency.
Behavior Analysis- Our 2022 behavior data shows that there were 335 discipline referrals written during the 21-22 school year. Of those, 71 referrals were written for Classroom Disruption. Additionally, there were 86 discipline referrals written for Fighting and/or Physical Attack. The discipline referrals resulted in a total of 163 days of In-School Suspension and 48 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

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 5th grade proficiency for reading and math and proficiency levels for 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?

One challenge that impacted students' success is the turnover rate of instructional staff in the 5th grade. This will be addressed by providing campus based reading and math 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 behavior interventionist will provide coaching, support, and monitoring to address behavioral concerns and facilitate the implementation of strategies that will increase student engagement.

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 84% of Kindergarten students measured below grade level in reading. On the final iReady Diagnostic 77% of students were on or above grade level. Additionally, at the start of the school year 7% of second grade students demonstrated grade-level proficiency. On the final diagnostic assessment 42% of students demonstrated proficiency.

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

During the 21-22 school year additional support was provided to the primary grade levels through additional para support during core instruction. Teachers were provided with supports from the district literacy coach that was assigned to the school 3 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 and 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 support facilitation teacher 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.

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 interventions, 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. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	For the 22-23 school year our focus will be on creating a supportive school environment to increase teacher recruitment and retention. Our 2021-2022 data shows that 45% of the instructional teachers left Callaway Elementary. By increasing our teacher retention rate, we will be able to provide consistency with instruction, our school vision, and procedures from year to 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 teachers that leave during or after the school year. In the 2021-2022 school year, we had 14 teachers leave. We reduce that number to 3 or less teachers leaving Callaway.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will work closely with our PLC teams to ensure our teachers receive the support they need in order to be successful. There will be a mid-year state of school meetings to look at areas of focus for retention and get teacher feedback of current progress. At the end of the year, we will review the climate survey data from our teachers and evaluate the number of teachers who indicate that they plan on returning to Callaway for the 2023-2024 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Good (goodlm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	We will provide support to our teachers by attending Ron Clark Academy to increase teacher engagement. We will implement Robyn Jackson's Buildership University systems and strategies to help coach our new teachers and veteran teachers in the best ways possible. Admin will have active participation in PLCs and we will have coaches available for reading and math. We will also conduct one on one meetings with our grade chair team.

implemented for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Ron Clark Academy has effective strategies for engaging scholars and giving teachers strategies to improve their professional practice. Robyn Jackson's Buildership University gives strategies for developing a mission and vision for the school along with coaching teachers in the best way possible based on their skill levels and experience. Administration will attend PLCs to help keep the teachers accountable and be present to give feedback and support on a regular basis. Our coaches will be able to model effective teaching strategies and help our teachers plan for instruction and pacing throughout the school year. Our one on one meetings with the grade chairs will help us to know the needs of each grade level throughout the year and increase communication so we can provide support where it is needed.

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.

Select teachers that will attend training at Ron Clark Academy

Person Responsible	Michelle Good (goodlm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Schedule time to attend PLC meetings weekly

Person Responsible	Michelle Good (goodlm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Schedule One on One meetings with the grade chair representatives

Person Responsible	Michelle Good (goodlm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Coaches will push into classes and schedule times and dates for modeling assisting grade levels in PLC planning.

Person Responsible	Dee Schmidt (schmida@bay.k12.fl.us)

Purchase Robyn Jackson's book for administration and sign up for Buildership University

Person Responsible	Michelle Good (goodlm@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, 77% of Kindergarten students met grade-level expectations. This was a dramatic increase from the 16% 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 42% of Second Grade students demonstrated proficiency.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA ELA data, 73% of students in the fourth grade and 65% 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 2023 Spring Florida Progress Monitoring FAST-STAR Assessments 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 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. Grade level PLCs along with school-level interventionists, 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 II and TIER III interventions.

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

Good, Michelle, goodlm@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?

Bay County has adopted state approved ELA Curriculum , HMH, which is correlated with the new FL BEST Standards. This curriculum is designed to provide quality instruction on the new BEST standards through a gradual release model starting with whole group lessons then allowing students to interact with the text and practice the skills in small group and individualized activities. In addition, the curriculum includes Table Top lessons designed to differentiate instruction in small groups and enables grade level texts to be accessible to all learners. The curriculum also includes Table Top lessons for ELL students allowing them to access and interact with grade level texts and skills. Students' progress will 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.

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 Houghton Mifflin Harcourt training through HMH. Additionally, returning staff will receive targeted professional development facilitated by district 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.	Good, Michelle, goodlm@bay.k12.fl.us
Our school based literacy coach will provide on-going support to our grade level PLCs as they plan instruction, monitor student performance, and provide targeted interventions.	Good, Michelle, goodlm@bay.k12.fl.us
Teachers will meet in PLCs to analyze formative and summative assessment data along with iReady diagnostic and growth monitoring data. Administrators will take part in these PLC meetings to ensure that the curriculum is being instructed with fidelity and that students are receiving necessary support and interventions.	Good, Michelle, goodlm@bay.k12.fl.us

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.

At Callaway Elementary we believe positive school culture and supportive relationships are the foundational elements of a fulfilling learning environment. Through the implementation of the Core Essentials, our "Essential 15 Expectations," positive behavioral interventions, Classroom Morning Meetings, teacher-to-student mentorships, and school counselor leadership lessons, we are engaging our scholars in ample opportunities to participate in positive and fulfilling character learning experiences and community building. At Callaway Elementary we place a strong emphasis on learning environments in which high levels of student engagement are promoted in order to deliver rigorous content and standards. Teachers and staff

are encouraged to be creative and think outside the box when developing lessons and establishing their classroom environment. These expectations promote attendance and classroom participation schoolwide. In addition we provide our scholars with additional support to meet each individual's academic and behavioral needs through our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), Inclusion Setting, and English Language Learning Programs. The Callaway "Leadership Lessons" ensure that all scholars receive systematic lessons designed to provide them with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills appropriate for their developmental level. The monthly lessons build relational trust and cultivate a positive school climate at Callaway Elementary School.

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

Our administration, teachers, support staff, scholars, and school families all have an understanding of the Callaway Essential Fifteen Expectations and our Core Essentials. Stakeholders understand their critical role in the development of positive school culture and life skills of our scholars. The administration supports the classroom teachers and support staff in the implementation of the schoolwide character learning through the daily morning meetings. During this time, the scholars learn about character traits and habits which will prepare them for a variety of social situations on campus and in life. Finally, our school counselor facilitates a positive school climate through his monthly leadership lessons with the scholars.