

Bay District Schools

# St. Andrew School At Oakland Terrace



## 2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>R.A.I.S.E</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>

## St. Andrew School At Oakland Terrace

2010 W 12TH ST, Panama City, FL 32401

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

**Principal: Kathryn Ostrenga**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2021-22 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Function</b> (per accountability file)	Alternative
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Unsatisfactory 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>	2023-24: No Rating

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of St. Andrew School, in participation with our families and the community, is committed to providing a safe learning environment that promotes each child's social/emotional and academic development through positive behavioral supports and research-based practices. All students are provided opportunities to develop and achieve according to their own strengths in preparation for integration into the least restrictive educational and social setting.

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

St. Andrew will provide a standard of excellence and positive supports in a safe environment where all students can achieve their full potential in academic, behavioral, and character development.

#### **Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.**

St. Andrew serves Bay District's Elementary students with significant behavioral needs. The majority of the students on St. Andrew's campus have been identified as having an Emotional/Behavioral Disability. St. Andrew's meets their needs by providing comprehensive schoolwide support. These supports include a smaller teacher-to-student ratio, para support at levels, increased supervision across the campus, schoolwide behavior expectations, and a structured behavior accountability system/

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ostrenga, Kathy	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
Payne, Shandra	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
Nakamura, Elizabeth	Administrative Support	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
Jateff, Valerie	Teacher, ESE	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
Havel, Max	Teacher, ESE	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
Schatz, Leah	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
Matthews, Lucinda	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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		objectives for each student, collaborate with general education teachers to ensure all students receive standards based instruction
Cummings, Kristin	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

**Is education provided through contract for educational services?**

No

**If yes, name of the contracted education provider.**

N/A

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Kathryn Ostrenga

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

101

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

28

**Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?**

**Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?**

**Number of teachers with ESE certification?**

26

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

25

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

3

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**2022-23**

**The number of students by 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	13	22	12	18	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	4	10	5	10	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	4	1	1	2	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

**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	6	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/25/2022

**2021-22 - Updated**

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

## 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		51%	56%					55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains								59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								57%	53%
Math Achievement		48%	50%					56%	63%
Math Learning Gains								54%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								42%	51%
Science Achievement		50%	59%					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	43%	61%	-18%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	25%	58%	-33%	58%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	4%	56%	-52%	56%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

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	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					
	2019	4%	54%	-50%	60%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	8%	54%	-46%	53%	-45%
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	40	46		29	46		27				
BLK	25			23							
WHT	45	44		35	56		27				
FRL	34	33		21	45		14				
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	36	10		37	20		8				

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
BLK	29			36							
WHT	43			45							
FRL	33			32			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	20	17		27	26		10				
BLK	20	9		14	18						
WHT	25	33		40	40						
FRL	17	19		28	28		6				

## ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	181
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
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	24
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	41
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### **Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?**

The first Area of Focus from the previous year's School Improvement Plan was related to increasing ELA proficiency in the 3rd, 4th and 5th grades. Student progress throughout the school year was monitored through iReady Diagnostic assessments which are aligned with FL BEST Standards. Additionally, progress was monitored through formative and summative assessments. Student performance was analyzed at weekly PLC meetings and instruction was planned and adjusted based on the students' needs.

The second area of focus was in relation to student behavior and was measured by student discipline referrals. The 21-22 school year saw a dramatic increase in discipline referrals relating to fighting and/or physical attack. There are several factors that may have contributed to this increase including a change in administration and the first full year back following the pandemic. Reducing the number of incidents involving fighting and/or physical attack is the primary area of focus for the 22-23 school year.

#### **Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Based on iReady Diagnostic progress monitoring data we saw tremendous growth in our primary grade levels. At the beginning of the school year 50% of Kindergarten students measured at grade level in reading. On the final iReady Diagnostic 80% of Kindergarten students were on or above grade level. On the first diagnostic 8% of 1st graders demonstrated proficiency and on the final diagnostic 46% were proficient. Additionally, at the start of the school year 26% of fourth grade students demonstrated grade-level proficiency. On the final diagnostic assessment 44% of students demonstrated proficiency.

#### **What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?**

Based on the FSA data and iReady Diagnostic Assessment the greatest areas of need are in the areas of reading and 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 trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Academic Analysis- In reviewing the FSA ELA data 33% of students in the third grade demonstrated proficiency, 54% of students in the fourth grade demonstrated proficiency and 20% of fifth graders demonstrated proficiency. In the area of math, 15% of third grade students demonstrated proficiency on the 2022 FSA math, 50% of fourth graders demonstrated proficiency, and 11% 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 36% of students demonstrated proficiency. However, 24% of students identified as Black/African American demonstrated proficiency.

Behavior Analysis- Our 21-22 behavior data shows that there were a total of 1,879 discipline referrals written. Of those, 793 of those were written for Fighting/Physical Attack. Additionally, there were 361 discipline referrals written for Skipping on Campus. The discipline referrals resulted in a total of 32 days

of In-School Suspension and 99 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 strategies 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 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.

## **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, 80% of Kindergarten students met grade-level expectations. This was a dramatic increase from the 50% of Kindergarten students that showed proficiency at the beginning of the school year. 46% 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 2022 FSA ELA data, 33% of students in the third grade, 54% of students in the fourth grade, and 20% of students in fifth grade are performing at a satisfactory level or above.

#### **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.

Ostrenga, Kathy, ostrekl@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. The curriculum includes Table Top lessons designed to differentiate instruction and enables grade-level texts to be accessible to all learners. The curriculum includes Table Top lessons for ELL students. Students' progress will also be monitored through iReady. Students will participate in diagnostic assessments in Fall, Winter, and Spring. This data will be used to identify students that need support and interventions. Students will be assigned lessons to address learning deficits and provide instruction on pre-requisite skills.

### **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 HMMH. 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.	Ostrenga, Kathy, ostrekl@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.	Ostrenga, Kathy, ostrekl@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.	Ostrenga, Kathy, ostrekl@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).	Ostrenga, Kathy, ostrekl@bay.k12.fl.us

## Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

**Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.**

PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

**Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.**

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. 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.

### Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

Our administration, teachers, support staff, scholars, and school families 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.

### Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

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.

### 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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Leadership team will refine (or develop) schoolwide expectations which will be posted throughout the campus	Ostrenga, Kathy, ostrekl@bay.k12.fl.us
Staff trained on the schoolwide expectations and provided the tools and strategies to implement PBIS during pre-planning	Ostrenga, Kathy, ostrekl@bay.k12.fl.us
Staff trained during pre-planning on de-escalation strategies through mandatory virtual professional development	Ostrenga, Kathy, ostrekl@bay.k12.fl.us
PBIS Team will meet monthly to review data, identify areas of need, and adjust procedures to meet the needs of students and staff	Ostrenga, Kathy, ostrekl@bay.k12.fl.us