

Bay District Schools

Parker 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Parker Elementary School

640 S HIGHWAY 22 A, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Chris Coan

Start Date for this Principal: 5/28/2017

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 (38%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Parker Elementary School

640 S HIGHWAY 22 A, 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	64%

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.

Parker Elementary School (PES) seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success of all students through developmentally appropriate instruction that acknowledges individual differences and learning styles.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of all Parker Elementary School stakeholders is to meet the needs of all students by granting them diverse educational opportunities by means of:

- Instruction designed to prepare students for mastery of Florida State Standards.
- Learning that develops skills for students to improve in language arts, mathematics, and school safety.
- Opportunities to exhibit responsibilities and promote self-esteem.
- Teamwork to become productive citizens.

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
Coan, Christopher	Principal	Principal of the School
Barron, Christen	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of School
Hurst, BethAnn	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Interventionist
Siler, Amber	School Counselor	Lead Guidance Counselor
McGee, Marian	Instructional Coach	MTSS Team Lead

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 5/28/2017, Chris Coan

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.*

2

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

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

480

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.

4

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	61	85	85	94	55	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	15	27	20	21	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	2	1	3	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	1	3	5	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	9	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	13	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	19	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	2	3	11	10	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	1	0	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	118	115	123	106	102	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	58	41	40	30	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	2	5	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	5	6	12	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	33	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	53	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	11	14	14	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	4	3	7	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	3	7	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	118	115	123	106	102	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	58	41	40	30	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	2	5	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	5	6	12	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	33	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	53	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	11	14	14	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	4	3	7	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	3	7	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	36%	51%	56%				43%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						54%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						63%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	23%	48%	50%				36%	56%	63%
Math Learning Gains	42%						48%	54%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						33%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	50%	59%				49%	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	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	58%	-25%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

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	30%	62%	-32%	62%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	59%	-16%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2022					
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	60%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	7	45	50	10	38	26	16				
ELL	37	65		17	43		46				
BLK	28	50		15	47	39	24				
HSP	40	61	36	24	41		50				
MUL	36	63		24	42		47				
WHT	35	54	50	28	37	20	38				
FRL	30	51	39	18	40	34	31				
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	11	25	30	11	5		18				
ELL	30			35							
BLK	27	33		15	7		22				
HSP	29	60		21	10						
MUL	37			37							
WHT	29	33		24	17		38				
FRL	27	33	53	17	9	13	28				
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	48		15	21	23	30				
ELL											
BLK	32	56		34	37		30				
HSP	52			33							
MUL	50	45		44	55						
WHT	42	51	54	33	51	40	56				
FRL	43	53	63	35	47	35	45				

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	42

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	335
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	46
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	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 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	37
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- In reviewing the FSA ELA data 23% of students in the third grade demonstrated proficiency, 31% of students in the fourth grade demonstrated proficiency and 49% of fifth graders demonstrated proficiency. In the area of math, 18% of students in third grade students demonstrated proficiency on the 2022 FSA math 22% of fourth graders demonstrated proficiency and 25 % 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 42% of students demonstrated proficiency. However, 27% of students with disabilities demonstrated proficiency.

Behavior Analysis- Our 2022 behavior data shows that there were a total of 635 discipline referrals during the 21-22 school year. Of those, 275 were written for Inappropriate Behavior/Language. Additionally, there were 179 discipline referrals written for Fighting and/or Physical Attack. The discipline referrals resulted in a total of 74 days of In-School Suspension and 298 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.

Additionally SWD have been deficient for 2 consecutive years, while Black/African American have been deficient for 3 years.

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 3rd grade proficiency for reading, math. Our focus will also be to ensure that our ESSA subgroups receive targeted instruction and interventions. 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?

Low percent of student achievement in ELA, Math, and Science. 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.

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

Increase in Learning Gains in Math, and ELA, Increased proficiency in ELA and ScienceBased on iReady Diagnostic progress monitoring data we saw tremendous growth in our primary grade levels. At the beginning of the school year 17% of Kindergarten students measured at grade level in reading. On the final iReady Diagnostic 82% of students were on or above grade level. On the first diagnostic 6% of 1st graders demonstrated proficiency and on the final diagnostic 36% were proficient. Additionally, at the start of the school year 6% of second grade students demonstrated grade-level proficiency. On the final diagnostic assessment 34% of students demonstrated proficiency.

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

Teachers were provided with supports from the district, support staff members were assigned based on need of the students. For the 22-23 school year the additional para support was extended to the each grade level. In addition, additional interventionist, increase collaboration with district literacy coaches and a math coaches 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.

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.

District Literacy Coach- 2 full days per week

District Instructional Specialist for Math- One-on-One support

District Instructional Specialist for ELA- Work with PLCs and One-on One support

School Improvement Specialist- coordinate support in all areas

Site Based MTSS Coordinator

District Based MTSS Specialist-Support and Train Site based

Bi-weekly "check-ins" with Director of Elementary Education and support team

ESE Resource Teacher- Provide support and training to ESE Teachers

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. 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 ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Increased achievement in ELA based on deficiencies from data analysis in state assessment data, diagnostic data.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

100% of students of Parker Elementary will make a years worth of growth based on FAST Assessment Data.

Monitoring:

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

Ongoing PLC, FAST Testing 3 times a year

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Parker Elementary non - negotiables are to ensure small group instruction is occurring daily, with the support of additional staff members in the classrooms. The increased support staff will help to reduce class size. We will implement an additional 60 minutes of Reading Instruction daily. We will hire an additional academic interventionist to help with MTSS Tier 3, MTSS T2 booster Groups, and ensure fidelity of programs are met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

36% of students earning a LLevel 3+ on FSA Grades 3-5

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.

PLC Meetings, Lesson Plans, Targeted Feedback

Person Responsible Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Using the PLC process to ensure a viable / guaranteed curriculum. 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.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

Lesson Plans will be reviewed in comparison to PLC Notes. The number of lessons plans being fully alligned with grade level will be 100% by the 2nd nine weeks.

Weekly meeting with PLC, tracking numbers, Tier 2 students and outcomes for MTSS Students with the Student services PLC Team..

Monitoring:

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

Weekly PLC meetings with observation of notes, attending meetings, and reviewing lesson plans

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

PLC planning acuarng on grade level grade level materials

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

35% ELA and 23% Math students achieving a 3+ on FSA Assessments.

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.

Attending, giving feedback, providing support for PLCs

Person Responsible Christopher Coan (coancm@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, 75% of Kindergarten students met grade-level expectations. This was dramatic increase from the 13% of Kindergarten students that showed proficiency at the beginning of the school year.

35% of First Grade students demonstrated proficiency on the Spring iReady Diagnostic Assessment and 27% of Second Grade students demonstrated proficiency.

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

Based on the the 2022 FSA ELA data, 23 % of third grade students, 31% of students in the fourth grade and 49% 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.

Coan, Christopher, coancm@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 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. In addition the curriculum includes Table Top lessons designed to differentiate instruction. Additionally, the curriculum includes Table Top lessons for ELL students. Along with the implementation of the HMH curriculum, students' progress will also be monitored through iReady. 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.	Coan, Christopher, coancm@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.	
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.	

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.

WE utilize our PBS Program "All Aboard" We focus on being Respectful, Responsible, and Ready to Learn. Our teachers utilize our Behavior Tracking form to track Positive and Areas of Improvement in the three R's. We have a PROMISE Room to help with de-escalation, mental health Triad to work with mental illness, small group instruction, and individualized counseling. Additionally we are a Community Partnership school with the collaboration of Children's Home SOciety, Gulf Coast State College and Pancare Health to support our families with specific needs to their families.

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

Elizabeth Hurst - Behavior Interventionist

Actively monitoring the behavior tracking form, developing and monitoring Tier 2 Check in Check outs, developing PBIP plans.

Amber Sller, dawn Durant - Guidance

Implementation of the second step curriculum (Tier 1 PBS Curriculum) Implementation of lessons in the classroom.

Lynisse Mourning, Mary Ann Herald - Mental Health

Tier 2 / Tier 3 Support groups with PBIS

Sharis Robinson, Amie Parsons - Children's Home Society, CPS

Provide additional supports for families with Positive Behaviors in schools.