

Bay District Schools

Patronis Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Patronis Elementary School

7400 PATRONIS DR, Panama City Beach, FL 32408

[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.

Our mission statement is Patronis Elementary School teachers, administrators, parents, and the community share the responsibility to provide a variety of curriculum, instructional, and assessment opportunities with the high expectation for every student to become a competent self-directed lifelong learner. We also share in the district mission: We are a compassionate community dedicated to providing each student with pathways to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe each student is important; Every student can learn; Some students need more time; All students can become responsible for their learning; Learning takes place in an orderly, caring environment. We also share in the district vision: Teaching. Inspiring. Encouraging.

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
Loyed, Brooke	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
McKenzie, Katie	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.
Ankoviak, 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.
Bray, Christina	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.
Jackson, Katy	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.
Porter, Brenda	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.
McMillian, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data.
Hull, Anna	Teacher, K-12	Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data.
West, Christopher	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.
Kirkland, Kenneth	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.
Patrick, Kendall	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.
Mathis, Michele	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.
Rose, Alison	Other	In charge of all things communication, parent notification via PeachJar, Facebook, and school newsletters, works with district communications team to identify and promote dates for district initiatives, as well as promotion of school-based activities and PTO events.
Pipkorn, Lorey	Other	Assists in organizing events to involve community members that may include volunteer work, donations, or sponsorships for the school, as well as organizing activities for students to participate in that are considered outreach to our local organizations to include food and clothing collections, donations, and volunteer hours.

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.

Our parents, students, and staff are involved in all facets of improvement. From Stakeholder surveys (Climate Surveys) to School Advisory Committee meetings to PTO meetings, all voices are heard and considered. School testing data is shared with teachers and parents and students just as soon as it is received. This year parents were able to see their own student's data within a week of testing. Our Professional Learning Communities analyze data and look for celebrations and areas for improvement. During our Preschool Inservice, our stakeholders look at school, district and state data and provide input into what overarching goals we should have. Our behavior team and MTSS teams look at all behavior data to formulate action plans. Our SIP is reviewed and approved by our SAC each year.

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))

Our SIP main goals are discussed throughout the year in SAC meetings, PLC meetings and with the district. Low quartile students and any subgroup students will be on laser focus throughout the year. All data is updated during the October FTE and again at the February FTE (all discussed with teachers). Because our SIP is fluid we have the ability to update, allocate resources, change, redirect throughout the 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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)

	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	0	4	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	4	2	6	3	5	3	0	0	0	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	6	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	14	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	9	5	4	3	4	0	0	0	34

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	2	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	9

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	6	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	10	17	15	8	16	12	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	3	1	4	5	1	5	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	8	14	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	13	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	11	8	7	5	5	0	0	0	41

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	3	5	4	3	2	9	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	14
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	10	17	15	8	16	12	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	3	1	4	5	1	5	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	8	14	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	13	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	11	8	7	5	5	0	0	0	41

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	3	5	4	3	2	9	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	14
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*	65	47	53	70	51	56	70		
ELA Learning Gains				68			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			22		
Math Achievement*	62	50	59	69	48	50	70		
Math Learning Gains				62			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			24		
Science Achievement*	62	48	54	62	50	59	68		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	56	59	85			79		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	318
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	527
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	48			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	2	
HSP	58			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	68			

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%
FRL	55			

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	44			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	62			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	58			

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	65			62			62					60
SWD	42			42			57				4	
ELL											1	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			32							2	
HSP	52			52							4	64
MUL	74			61			60				3	

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
PAC												
WHT	68			65			64				4	
FRL	56			49			51				4	

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	70	68	60	69	62	51	62					85
SWD	38	48	60	47	50	52	15					
ELL	38			46								85
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			33								
HSP	54	60		46	67							83
MUL	82	69		86	69							
PAC												
WHT	73	69	56	73	59	44	63					
FRL	63	70	68	52	55	54	43					

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	70	48	22	70	53	24	68					79
SWD	45	20		47	33		35					
ELL	60			70								79
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	69	60		69	50		70					83
MUL	56			68								
PAC												
WHT	74	46	20	72	55	13	72					
FRL	57	40	27	55	43	21	61					

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
05	2023 - Spring	68%	52%	16%	54%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	47%	22%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	71%	54%	17%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	53%	1%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	49%	10%	51%	8%

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 that showed the lowest performance was the overall Math achievement at 63%. Contributing factors to last year's low performance include an increase in students who were absent for more than 10% of the school year, as well as a new testing format (computer-based testing) and frequency of testing (three times per year). Between 21-22 school year and 22-23 school year, the number of third, fourth, and fifth grade students who were absent for more than 10% of the school year doubled in number.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous school year was the overall Math achievement at 63%, down from 69% the 21-22 school year. Contributing factors to last year's low performance include an increase in students who were absent for more than 10% of the school year, as well as a new testing format (computer-based testing) and frequency of testing (three times per year). Between 21-22 school year and 22-23 school year, the number of third, fourth, and fifth grade students who were absent for more than 10% of the school year doubled in number.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was ELA Achievement. According to the F.A.S.T. Reporting site, the state average for ELA Achievement is 54%. Patronis Elementary's average for ELA Achievement is 66%, 12% higher than the state.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement for our school was our Science achievement percentage, increasing from 62% in 21-22 to 63% in 22-23.

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

As we reflect on the EWS data from part one, a potential area of concern for our school is the number of students who were absent for more than 10% of the school year.

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

1. Increase ELA achievement in grades 3, 4, and 5
2. Decrease number of students with one or more suspensions
3. Increase percentage of students showing achievement in state identified subgroup

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

At the Superintendent's Summit, we received a document titled "2021-22 Federal Percent of Points Index - As of February 13, 2023." This report indicated that we have a subgroup of students, Black/African American, who are not meeting the Federal Percent of Points Index (at or below 41%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the Federal Percent of Points Index for our Black/African American subgroup of students from 36% to 100% on the third progress monitoring for F.A.S.T. testing.

Monitoring:

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

PLC's and admin will monitor iReady testing, classroom assessments (formative and summative), MTSS data, and AR/STAR data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Loyed (loyedbm@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.)

PLC's Main strategy: Be trained thoroughly and continue HMH reading curriculum that provides grade-level instruction

Other: Be trained thoroughly and continue with i-Ready program to meet individual learner's needs
Continue Tier 3 interventions with fidelity and continue after school learning recovery program (tutoring) if provided funds from district.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is aligned to district expectations and strategies.

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.

PLC's will attend live/in person HMH trainings over summer and during school year.

Person Responsible: Brooke Loyed (loyedbm@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2023 (throughout school year)

PLC meetings will work together on planning, teaching, and assessments. Most PLC's will use reading (ELA) as their deliberate practice this year.

Person Responsible: Brooke Loyed (loyedbm@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2023 (throughout school year)

PLC's will identify and provide Tier 3 reading intervention to those in MTSS

Person Responsible: Michele Mathis (mathim@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2023 (throughout school year)

During summer of 2023, provide all instructional personnel with their students' data for 2022-2023 and a low quartile list for 4th and 5th grade. iReady information will also be used to look at low quartiles in grades 3, 4,5. Lists will be updated depending on enrollment and will be finalized in October and February. PLC's, MTSS, ESE, and support personnel will all use low quartile data to drive decision making processes. Special emphasis on subgroup.

Person Responsible: Brooke Loyed (loyedbm@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 30, 2023

#2. 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.

As we analyzed our Early Warning System indicators this summer, we noticed that we have 19 students with one or more suspensions. While this is a decrease from the previous school year (22 students to 19 students), we would like to see a decrease in this total to ensure that students are in school as much as possible.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease number of students with one or more suspensions from 19 to 0.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly reports from FOCUS Analytics, monthly C.A.R.E. team meetings, discussions with teachers and PLC's, MTSS meetings for behavior.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Loyed (loyedbm@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.)

Panther Code School-wide expectations (school wide Tier 1 Behavior), foster culter of Resiliency Characteristics, Promise Para and Behavior para will be in place, MTSS Behavior meetings and data chats, Utilize mental health resources available-Triad, Community of Care referrals, guidance referrals, C.A.R.E. team meetings to problem-solve for students who demonstrate an increase in discipline incidents.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It takes many resources to provide just in time teaching and learning for behavior. Our school uses proactive techniques up front in order to reduce the number of behavior interventions needed (Social Groups, Check-in/Check-out, mentoring, Elevate Bay mentoring).

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.

Positive referrals, Panther Trait celebrations, Daily ITV announcements, Special Area PLC will focus on this area, paras in place, Triad in place, MTSS Behavior in place (data chats, etc.), Community of Care Referrals for families

Person Responsible: Brooke Loyed (loyedbm@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2023 (throughout school year)

#3. 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.

We utilized the F.A.S.T. reporting system to determine ELA achievement for our school. Our data indicates that the overall average for ELA achievement is at 66%. This is a decrease from the previous two school years, when ELA achievement was at 70%. 2023: Third grade 69% proficient, Fourth grade 63% proficient, 5th grade 67% proficient for average of 66%. Although our Informational School Grade should be an A this year according to our hand calculation (including Science and Math Achievement), we will continue to work towards 100% proficient (Level 3 and above) in ELA/Reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELA achievement percentage from 66% to 80%

Monitoring:

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

PLC's and admin will monitor iReady testing, classroom assessments, MTSS data, AR STAR data, Progress Monitoring #2 (mid year)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Loyed (loyedbm@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.)

PLC's Main strategy: Be trained thoroughly and continue with HMH reading curriculum to provide grade-level instruction
 Other: Be trained thoroughly and continue with iReady program
 Continue Tier 3 interventions with fidelity and continue afterschool learning recovery program (tutoring) if funding is provided by district

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is aligned to district expectations and strategies.

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.

PLC's will attend live/in person HMH trainings over summer and during school year.

Person Responsible: Brooke Loyed (loyedbm@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2023 (throughout school year)

PLC meetings will work together on planning, teaching, and assessments. Most PLC's will use reading (ELA) as their deliberate practice this year.

Person Responsible: Brooke Loyed (loyedbm@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2023 (throughout school year)

PLC's will identify and provide Tier 3 reading intervention to those in MTSS

Person Responsible: Michele Mathis (mathim@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2023 (throughout school year)

Continue implementation of Patronis' reading incentive program, 10 Book Challenge, Millionaire's Club, and reward students as they meet their reading goals (including Accelerated Reader). AR celebrations, DEAR (Drop Everything and Read) Monthly special events, and iReady/FAST/STAR growth celebrations will also be utilized. Patronis will continue its Reading First program (Homework is focused on self-selected reading based on research by John Hattie-author of Visible Learning- and Stu Greenberg).

Person Responsible: Carol Senn (senncb@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 24, 2023 (throughout school year)

During summer of 2023, provide all instructional personnel with their students' data for 2022-2023 and a low quartile list for 4th and 5th grade. iReady information will also be used to look at low quartiles in grades 3, 4,5. Lists will be updated depending on enrollment and will be finalized in October and February. PLC's, MTSS, ESE, and support personnel will all use low quartile data to drive decision making processes. Special emphasis on subgroup.

Person Responsible: Brooke Loyed (loyedbm@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 30, 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

In Bay District, we are a collaborative team. Together, the district office supports school leaders and staff members in developing spending plans that are directly aligned with their SIP goals. With the leadership of our Director of Federal Programs, the district monitors expenses bi-weekly and updates the financial spreadsheet. In an effort to be transparent, this spreadsheet is shared with stakeholders including district leaders, school leaders, and pertinent school staff members. In the event there is a need to update or modify the plan based on a change in need, then the group collaborates to develop an amendment.