

Bay District Schools

A. Gary Walsingham Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

A. Gary Walsingham Academy

44 CHIP SEAL PARKWAY, Panama City Beach, FL 32407

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

A. Gary Walsingham Academy is dedicated to providing a safe and collaborative school environment that focuses on building positive relationships, nurturing individual differences, and igniting a passion for innovative exploration and learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A collaborative focus on every student every day.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harvey, Amy	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
Gall, Chad	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
Edwards, Jennifer	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
Kirk, Elise	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
Quimuyog, Pamela	Instructional Media	provide accessible tools for students and staff to direct, enhance, and support the learning process, collaborating with staff, teaching skills to students and staff, and maintaining the holdings of the Media Center.
Lewis, Kelly	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
Hornkohl, Jennifer	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
Conner, Kari	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
Maddux, Allison	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
Cox, Sharen	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
Reding, Vicki	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
Johnson, Jeremy	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

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Leadership Team consists of teachers from each grade level, administration, media specialist, school counselor and interventionist. This team collaborated to analyze and reflect on schoolwide data. The team identified specific areas of focus and developed a plan for improvement.

In addition, the School Advisory Council will assist in the development of the school improvement plan by reviewing the draft, providing feedback, and approving the final revisions. Throughout the school year, the school improvement plan is revisited and discussed by the SAC and the administration.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Leadership Team will meet monthly to review schoolwide, grade level, and individual student data to evaluate the impact of the instructional strategies identified in the School Improvement Plan. Grade-level professional learning communities and administration will review progress monitoring data, common assessment results, and student work routinely to evaluate the impact on student achievement. MTSS data chats will be held monthly to monitor and evaluate the achievement of students with the greatest achievement gap. Classroom walkthroughs will be completed to monitor implementation and evaluate the effectiveness of the identified instructional strategies within the classroom.

By engaging in the ongoing process of continuous collaborative inquiry, we will be able to identify areas that may require course corrections throughout the year. If necessary, additional resources, additional support, or a change in interventions will be considered if the anticipated growth in student achievement is not evident. If this is the case, the plan will be revised accordingly.

In addition, the school improvement plan is revisited and discussed by the SAC and the administration throughout the school year.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-4
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	41%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	19	26	14	12	10	0	0	0	0	81	
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	25	14	17	4	0	0	0	0	0	60	
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	25	14	17	4	0	0	0	0	0	60	
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	64	47	53		51	56			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	50	50	59		48	50			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		48	54		50	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	56	59						

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	245
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	59			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	64			50								67
SWD												
ELL											1	67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71			59							3	
FRL	69			38							3	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	47%	6%	50%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	50%	54%	-4%	59%	-9%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component with the lowest performance for the 22-23 school year was 3rd grade Math with 50% scoring a level 3 or above. There is no trend data to analyze as this is our first year having third graders.

Approximately 18% of the 3rd-grade students missed 10% or more of the school year. The district-approved math curriculum was aligned to the previous standards and teachers struggled to properly align the lessons to the new B.E.S.T Standards. The absence of a dedicated school-based math coach was also a contributing factor.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

A. Gary Walsingham opened in the 2021-2022 school year serving students in grades K-2. Third grade was added in the 2022-2023 school year so there is no prior year data to analyze.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Third Grade Math had the greatest gap between state and school average. Fifty percent of A. Gary Walsingham Academy's third grade students scored at an achievement level of three or above compared to the state average of fifty-eight percent.

Attendance was a contributing factor with approximately 18% percent of 3rd grade students missing 10% or more of the school year. The district-approved math curriculum was aligned to the previous standards and teachers struggled to properly align the lessons to the new B.E.S.T Standards. The absence of a dedicated school-based math coach was also a contributing factor.

A. Gary Walsingham opened in the 2021-2022 school year serving students in grades K-2. Third grade was added in the 2022-2023 school year so there is no trend data to analyze.

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

A. Gary Walsingham opened in the 2021-2022 school year serving students in grades K-2. Third grade was added in the 2022-2023 school year so there is no prior year data to analyze.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The number of students that missed 10% or more of the school year is a potential area of concern across multiple grade levels. The number of students with multiple EWS indicators is another area of potential concern.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase student academic achievement
2. Increase the daily student attendance rate with an emphasis on arriving on time
3. Increase student, parent, and community involvement in the educational process

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A. Gary Walsingham Academy's Early Warning System data indicates that approximately 27% of the student population was absent 10% or more of the school days during the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

A. Gary Walsingham Academy will decrease the percentage of students absent 10% or more of the school days by 10% in the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The attendance report will be reviewed monthly to identify students demonstrating a pattern of non-attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Edwards (edwarj@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A. Gary Walsingham Academy will create positive conditions for learning by being intentional in building strong and supportive relationships among students, faculty, staff, parents, and community members.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates that when positive conditions are in place students are more likely to attend and be engaged (attendanceworks.org). There is strong evidence that students benefit from strong family-school-community partnerships. According to Hattie, teacher-student relationships have a positive effect size of 0.72 on student achievement. A student's sense of belonging within a supportive school environment also has a positive impact on student attendance and achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Establish, teach, and reinforce schoolwide non-negotiable core values and expectations to create a safe and supportive environment for students, teachers, and staff.

Person Responsible: Chad Gall (gallch@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing

Schedule and host parent involvement activities and conferences to build positive school-family partnerships.

Person Responsible: Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing

Establish and build positive relationships with business partners through Partnership Bay to assist with establishing positive conditions for learning that will benefit students and teachers. Community partners will be instrumental in meeting the basic needs of students such as food and clothing.

Person Responsible: Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A. Gary Walsingham Academy's faculty will actively participate as a member of a school-based high-functioning Professional Learning Community. The 22-23 Math proficiency levels were below the state average and the 22-23 ELA proficiency levels were just slightly over state average.

The Professional Learning Communities will function as a collaborative team and assume collective responsibility for the learning of 100% of students. The PLCs will work together to clarify exactly what each student must learn, monitor student progress, and provide interventions for struggling students. PLCs will also serve to provide teachers with job-embedded professional learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of the faculty at A. Gary Walsingham Academy will be a member of a Professional Learning Community and actively participate in weekly PLC meetings.

Monitoring:

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

The administration will regularly attend grade-level Professional Learning Community meetings to ensure that student learning is the main focus and that all PLC members are present and actively participating. PLC teams will utilize the approved agenda and minutes template that focuses on the Four Critical Questions of a PLC. The agenda and minutes will be uploaded to the grade-level Google shared drive.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional Learning Communities will serve to provide job-embedded professional learning to the faculty focused on delivering benchmark-aligned engaging lessons, analyzing student achievement data, and planning and delivering effective interventions for struggling learners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The U.S. Department of Education Institute of Educational Sciences indicates that for more than a decade education practitioners have promoted the Professional Learning Community (PLC) as an effective way to provide professional development to teachers to improve their pedagogy. By reflecting on and improving teaching practices, PLCs will have a positive impact on student achievement.

Teachers working together to map the learning progression of all students has an effect size of 1.20 according to educational researcher, John Hattie. The effect size of collective teacher efficacy is 1.57.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Develop a master schedule that prioritizes common grade-level planning requiring PLC teams to collaborate during contract hours at least once weekly.

Person Responsible: Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: July 31, 2023

Develop a common PLC agenda and minutes template to be utilized schoolwide to guide the work of the PLCs that focuses on DuFour's Four Critical Questions.

1. What do we want all students to know and be able to do?
2. How will we know when each student has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some students do not learn?
4. How will we extend the learning of students who are proficient?

The agenda will be uploaded at least 24 hours in advance of the upcoming meeting. The minutes will be uploaded weekly to the grade-level shared google drive.

Person Responsible: Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: July 31, 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

While A. Gary Walsingham Academy's 3rd grade FAST ELA achievement proficiency for the 22-23 school is slightly higher than the state percentage, 54% compared to the 50% state average, our goal is for 100% of our students to reach proficiency in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

It is the goal of A. Gary Walsingham Academy to have 100% of our students at or above grade level. In order to work towards this goal, at least 64% of our students in grades 3-4, will score a Level 3 or higher this school year as measured by the State ELA FAST PM3 assessment administered in May.

Monitoring:

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

The data from the FAST PM1 and PM2 will be analyzed to monitor progress in grades PreK-4. The iReady diagnostic will be administered in the Fall and Winter and utilized as an instructional tool to monitor progress, plan for instruction, and plan for appropriate interventions. PLCs will review student work samples, formative assessments, and district-common summative assessments frequently to track student progress. Classroom walkthrough data will be utilized to monitor instruction and student progress. Students will track their individual progress and participate in teacher-student data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A. Gary Walsingham Academy will implement the district-adopted Houghton Mifflin Harcourt curriculum with fidelity during the 90-minute uninterrupted reading block. We will schedule an additional 30 minutes of small group reading instruction daily to provide supplemental support to master grade-level essential benchmarks utilizing approved resources as outlined in Bay District Schools Comprehensive Reading Plan.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will need extra support in order to master essential grade-level benchmarks. By scheduling an additional dedicated block of time daily to provide systematic small-group interventions within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports, we will be able to reteach and accelerate student learning on essential benchmarks. The What Works Clearinghouse practice guides indicate there is Strong Evidence related to delivering evidence-based reading interventions based on students' needs. Researcher John Hattie concludes that RTI has an effect size of 1.29.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Create a master schedule that includes a dedicated 30 minutes of additional small group ELA instruction in grades K-4.

Person Responsible: Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: July 31, 2023

PLCs will monitor student progress frequently using progress monitoring data, formative assessments, common summative assessments, and student work samples. PLCs will identify and teachers will provide small-group instruction to students based on identified needs. PLCs will respond quickly and proactively.

Person Responsible: Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing

Provide professional learning opportunities for teachers related to benchmark-aligned instruction, HMMH, and supplemental resources available through the iReady toolbox to support reading instruction and interventions.

Person Responsible: Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A. Gary Walsingham's FAST Math achievement proficiency in grade 3 for the 22-23 school is 9% lower than the state percentage. 50% compared to the state's 59%

Measurable Outcome:

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

It is the goal of A.Gary Walsingham Academy to have 100% of our students at or above grade level. In order to work towards this goal, at least 60% of our students in grades 3-4, will score a Level 3 or higher this school year as measured by the State Math FAST PM3 assessment administered in May.

Monitoring:

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

The data from the FAST PM1 and PM2 will be analyzed to monitor progress in grades PreK-4. The iReady diagnostic will be administered in the Fall and Winter and utilized as an instructional tool to monitor progress, plan for instruction, and plan for appropriate interventions. PLCs will review student work samples, formative assessments, and district-common summative assessments frequently to track student progress. Classroom walkthrough data will be utilized to monitor instruction and student progress. Students will track their individual progress and participate in teacher-student data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A. Gary Walsingham Academy will implement the newly adopted BDS-approved Big Ideas math curriculum with fidelity during the 60-minute core math instructional block. We will provide an additional 30 minutes of small group math instruction to address deficits in prerequisite math skills students need to be successful with grade-level essential benchmarks using district-approved supplemental resources for math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will need extra support in order to master essential grade-level benchmarks. By scheduling an additional dedicated block of time daily to provide systematic small-group interventions within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports, we will be able to reteach and accelerate student learning on essential benchmarks. The What Works Clearinghouse practice guides indicate there is Strong Evidence related to delivering evidence-based math interventions based on students' needs. Researcher John Hattie concludes that RTI has an effect size of 1.29.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Create a master schedule that includes a dedicated 30 minutes of additional small group math instruction in grades K-4.

Person Responsible: Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: July 31, 2023

Provide professional learning opportunities for teachers related to the district-adopted Big Ideas Math Curriculum, effectively using math manipulatives during instruction, using the B1G-M to plan benchmark-aligned instruction, and using the iReady math prerequisite report to guide small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing

Teachers will utilize iReady Math data reports to determine students' learning needs, create student small groups based on similar needs, and utilize the identified lessons for small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Amy Harvey (harveam@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing