

Bay District Schools

Cedar Grove Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cedar Grove Elementary School

2826 E 15TH ST, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2022

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: F (27%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (38%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cedar Grove Elementary School

2826 E 15TH ST, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	F		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.

Cedar Grove exists to teach children how to learn and believe in themselves.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cedar Grove gets students excited enough about learning that all make at least a year's growth in a year's time while filling in gaps.

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
Walker, Cyndee	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.
Ehrhardt, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	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.
English, Carissa	Teacher, K-12	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.
Rivers, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	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.
Pearish, Emma	Teacher, K-12	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.
Walker, Talesa	Teacher, K-12	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.
Baxley, Adrian	Teacher, ESE	Responsible for planning, developing, delivering and evaluating appropriate individualized educational services, identify the needs of assigned students through formal and informal assessments, review student performance data and assessment data to develop appropriate goals and objectives for each student, collaborate with general education teachers to ensure all students receive standards based instruction.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Balentine, Rebecca	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.
Llorens, Yesenia		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
Echols, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	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.
Ferns, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	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.
Pearish, pauline	Teacher, K-12	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

Thursday 7/14/2022, Cynthia Walker

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.*

0

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

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

593

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

13

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	71	92	73	129	102	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	22	17	39	28	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	4	22	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	6	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	25	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	43	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	
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	0	3	1	20	26	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	4	1	26	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/25/2022

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	87	88	80	76	91	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518
Attendance below 90 percent	27	19	14	15	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	3	2	7	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	8	6	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	7	7	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	48	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	49	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	5	4	9	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	6	8	4	18	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	9	10	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	87	88	80	76	91	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518
Attendance below 90 percent	27	19	14	15	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	3	2	7	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	8	6	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	7	7	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	48	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	49	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	5	4	9	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	6	8	4	18	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	9	10	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	22%	51%	56%				33%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	39%						59%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	27%						70%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	20%	48%	50%				25%	56%	63%
Math Learning Gains	34%						41%	54%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						58%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	15%	50%	59%				34%	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	27%	61%	-34%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	28%	58%	-30%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2022					
	2019	32%	56%	-24%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

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	25%	62%	-37%	62%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	24%	59%	-35%	64%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2022					
	2019	20%	54%	-34%	60%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	23%	54%	-31%	53%	-30%
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	15	26	17	18	36	29	12				
ELL	11	28	21	16	29	27	12				
BLK	12	32	25	14	35	40	6				
HSP	19	30	27	18	29	36	9				
MUL	44	54		33	38						
WHT	36	51		28	32		21				
FRL	21	37	26	20	39	41	15				
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	8	36	58	11	11	18	4				
ELL	13	58		21	46						
BLK	10	28		9	14		7				
HSP	7	38		21	41						
MUL	45			50							
WHT	23	43		23	21		15				
FRL	14	33	63	20	25	25	10				
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	24	34	36	29	36	45	50				
BLK	27	61	85	19	45	73	13				
HSP	20			36							
MUL	50			36							
WHT	39	54		27	28	36	47				
FRL	32	58	69	23	41	58	34				

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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	245
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	25
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	27
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	34
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	32
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 25% of students in the third grade demonstrated proficiency, 19% of fourth graders demonstrated proficiency and 16% of fifth graders demonstrated proficiency. In the area of math, 17% of students demonstrated proficiency on the 2022 FSA math while 22% of students in the fourth grade demonstrated proficiency, and 16% of 5th grade students 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 the following ESSA subgroups are identified as underperforming; Students with Disabilities- 25%, English Language Learners- 25%, Black/African American Students 23%, Hispanic Students- 27%, White Students-34%, and Economically Disadvantaged Students- 32% 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 behavior 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 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.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Based on 2022 NGSSS Science Assessment, 12% of Cedar Grove's 5th grade students demonstrated proficiency in Science.

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

At the end of the 22-23 school year 25% of 5th grade students will demonstrate proficiency on Florida Science Standards based on the NGSSS Science Assessment.

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

Standards based common Formative and Summative Assessments will be used to measure proficiency. The data will be shared weekly in grade level PLCs, bi-weekly with the Science Instructional Specialist, and monthly at school based data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Using the district adopted curriculum of elevateScience which supports the Next Generation Science Standards, teachers will provide students with hands-on science labs and other opportunities to make science visible, including making real-world connections and connections to mathematics.

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

Our student's science proficiency is the lowest in our district. Our teachers need to make science both relatable and engaging for students. Following Hattie's work with Alamarode, Fisher and Frey (Visible Learning for Science) we are working with district science experts to create hands-on activities and give appropriate, timely feedback, and use a gradual release model while teaching science.

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.

Have district staff model science lessons for science teachers, particularly 5th grade teachers.

Person Responsible Elena Grider (grideen@bay.k12.fl.us)

Specifically discuss science data in the 5th grade PLC. Typically, our focus has only been discussing data as it relates to math and reading.

Person Responsible Talesa Walker (walketr@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Behavior

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

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.
Our 2022 behavior data shows that there were 931 discipline referrals written during the 21-22 school year. Of those, 452 referrals were written for Classroom Disruption. Additionally, there were 187 discipline referrals written for Fighting and/or Physical Attack. The discipline referrals resulted in a total of 225 days of In-School Suspension and 193 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 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Balentine (balenrs@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.

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.

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.

Leadership team will refine (or develop) schoolwide expectations which will be posted throughout the campus

Staff trained during pre-planning on de-escalation strategies through mandatory virtual professional development

Staff trained on the schoolwide expectations and provided the tools and strategies to implement PBIS during pre-planning

PBIS Team will meet monthly to review data, identify areas of need, and adjust procedures to meet the needs of students and staff

Person

Responsible

Rebecca Balentine (balenrs@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, 81% of Kindergarten students met grade-level expectations. This level of proficiency decreased significantly with 34% of First Grade students demonstrating proficiency on the Spring iReady Diagnostic Assessment and 35% of Second Grade students demonstrated proficiency.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA ELA data, 75% of students in the third grade, 81% of fourth grade and 84% 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 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 II and TIER III interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Walker, Cyndee, walkeca@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 a 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 and then allowing students to interact with the text and practice the skills in small group and individualized activities. Along with the implementation of the HMH curriculum, students' progress will also be monitored through iReady. Students will participate in diagnostic assessments in Fall, Winter, and Spring. This diagnostic data will be used to identify students that need additional support and interventions. Students will be assigned individualized lessons to address learning deficits and provide instruction on pre-requisite skills necessary to master grade-level standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

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

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Into Reading core adopted instructional materials for K-5 English Language Arts. The series was reviewed and approved by the FLDOE for inclusion on the State Adopted List at time of adoption and purchase. To improve instruction and learning, BDS teachers incorporate explicit, direct instruction (effect size of .60) and 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.	Walker, Cyndee, walkeca@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.	Lay, Laura, layls@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.	Walker, Cyndee, walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us
For any student who has not responded to a specific reading intervention delivered with fidelity and with the initial intensity provided (time and group size), reading intervention instruction and/or materials may be changed based on student data. Diagnostic assessments will be required to identify specific needs (areas of strengths and weaknesses.) Further, schools are supported with district MTSS Staff Training Specialists and meet monthly to review student data, progress, and intervention materials. Additionally, schools follow the Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan and MTSS decision tree which indicates research based and evidence-based materials available for targeted interventions (Tier 2). If student data does not show progress at Tier 2 then adjustments will be made (teacher: student ration; time in intervention; intervention materials; instruction).	Walker, Cyndee, walkeca@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.

Because the school is in C,S & I, we lost a significant number of teachers, the principal, and assistant principal. The school formerly had several behavior initiatives (Ron Clark's House system, Leader in Me, and PBIS). We are having to work to rebuild our school culture. It is difficult losing so many key school members. This year, we have recrafted our mission and vision following Robyn Jackson's Stop Leading, Start Building. We kicked off the year with a block party and continue to provide ways for our community and parents to be involved in our school. We have several local businesses, service organizations, and churches who work with us, as well as many volunteer mentors provided through a program at our district.

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

Our title 1 director assists with planning informational nights and other opportunities for parents to be involved in our school. We have two parent liaisons to assist with whatever our parents need, from navigating school paperwork and computers to finding community partners to assist their families. Our PTO is called TFIT and it stands for Tiger Family Involvement Team. They work hard to do just what their title suggests. We have a promise para, three members of a student wellness team and a behavior interventionist who all work with students and families to ensure that students get the things they need for wellness. Our three administrators work with all of the above-mentioned groups to strengthen our school culture and to incorporate all stakeholders.