

Bay District Schools

Breakfast Point 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	12
III. Planning for Improvement	18
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Breakfast Point Academy

601 N RICHARD JACKSON BLVD, Panama City Beach, FL 32407

<https://breakfastpoint.bay.k12.fl.us/>

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.

Breakfast Point Academy will provide a positive and safe learning environment that fosters mutual respect among the community, staff, and students. We hold high expectations for our students as they grow into productive, knowledgeable, and responsible citizens.

One heart, one school, one vision...Every Ray, Every Day!

Provide the school's vision statement.

One heart, one school, one vision... Every Ray, Every Day! We believe in unlocking the leadership potential in every student in academics, relationships, and service to better prepare them for future successes.

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
Long, Bryan	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, and relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy
Wroblewski, Cheri	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, and relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy
Llorens, Yesenia	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, and relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy
Carmichael, Angela	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, and relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy
Cryderman, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Whitfield, Clint	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
Curtis, Jenna	Teacher, ESE	serves as a member of the Leadership Team that meets monthly to analyze data, school trends, and provide input for school decisions. The teacher serves as a grade or department chair who leads their PLCs and reports back to their team about Leadership Team decisions. The teacher also provides input on best practices and strategies to meet SIP goals and ultimately help impact student achievement.
Ficke, Amy	Teacher, K-12	serves as a member of the Leadership Team that meets monthly to analyze data, school trends, and provide input for school decisions. The teacher serves as a grade or department chair who leads their PLCs and reports back to their team about Leadership Team decisions. The teacher also

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		provides input on best practices and strategies to meet SIP goals and ultimately help impact student achievement.
Wright, Kristina	Teacher, K-12	serves as a member of the Leadership Team that meets monthly to analyze data, school trends, and provide input for school decisions. The teacher serves as a grade or department chair who leads their PLCs and reports back to their team about Leadership Team decisions. The teacher also provides input on best practices and strategies to meet SIP goals and ultimately help impact student achievement.
Noda, Jeanne	Teacher, K-12	serves as a member of the Leadership Team that meets monthly to analyze data, school trends, and provide input for school decisions. The teacher serves as a grade or department chair who leads their PLCs and reports back to their team about Leadership Team decisions. The teacher also provides input on best practices and strategies to meet SIP goals and ultimately help impact student achievement.
Monduy, Elena	Teacher, K-12	serves as a member of the Leadership Team that meets monthly to analyze data, school trends, and provide input for school decisions. The teacher serves as a grade or department chair who leads their PLCs and reports back to their team about Leadership Team decisions. The teacher also provides input on best practices and strategies to meet SIP goals and ultimately help impact student achievement.
Youngblood, Alex	Teacher, K-12	serves as a member of the Leadership Team that meets monthly to analyze data, school trends, and provide input for school decisions. The teacher serves as a grade or department chair who leads their PLCs and reports back to their team about Leadership Team decisions. The teacher also provides input on best practices and strategies to meet SIP goals and ultimately help impact student achievement.
Hickman, Meagan	Teacher, K-12	serves as a member of the Leadership Team that meets monthly to analyze data, school trends, and provide input for school decisions. The teacher serves as a grade or department chair who leads their PLCs and reports back to their team about Leadership Team decisions. The teacher also provides input on best practices and strategies to meet SIP goals and ultimately help impact student achievement.
Severs, Alex	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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Robin	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
Webb, Shelly	Teacher, ESE	serves as a member of the Leadership Team that meets monthly to analyze data, school trends, and provide input for school decisions. The teacher serves as a grade or department chair who leads their PLCs and reports back to their team about Leadership Team decisions. The teacher also provides input on best practices and strategies to meet SIP goals and ultimately help impact student achievement.
Stephens, Mary	Teacher, ESE	serves as a member of the Leadership Team that meets monthly to analyze data, school trends, and provide input for school decisions. The teacher serves as a grade or department chair who leads their PLCs and reports back to their team about Leadership Team decisions. The teacher also provides input on best practices and strategies to meet SIP goals and ultimately help impact student achievement.

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, school counselors, and interventionists. 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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: B
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	13	15	8	15	12	17	34	28	31	173
One or more suspensions	13	27	28	19	19	44	5	12	22	189
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	6	7	4	6	8	3	2	5	41
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	1	2	2	3	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	15	16	24	18	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	17	31	23	85
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	1	2	3

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	3	3	5	5	6	6	6	6	42

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	12	12	14	23	20	24	17	34	33	189	
One or more suspensions	4	3	3	5	8	8	11	29	10	81	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	3	0	3	1	3	1	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	2	3	3	2	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	14	19	28	22	35	127	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	7	17	35	24	28	117	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	10	4	12	2	8	5	11	1	55	

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	1	5	4	8	10	12	6	12	18	76

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	2	10	0	1	0	1	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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	12	12	14	23	20	24	17	34	33	189	
One or more suspensions	4	3	3	5	8	8	11	29	10	81	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	3	0	3	1	3	1	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	2	3	3	2	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	14	19	28	22	35	127	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	7	17	35	24	28	117	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	10	4	12	2	8	5	11	1	55	

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	1	5	4	8	10	12	6	12	18	76

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	2	10	0	1	0	1	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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*	56	49	53	59	52	55	57		
ELA Learning Gains				61			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			59		
Math Achievement*	72	58	55	68	35	42	62		
Math Learning Gains				62			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			70		
Science Achievement*	69	56	52	67	55	54	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	65	68	83	55	59	82		
Middle School Acceleration	67	70	70	72	41	51	71		
Graduation Rate		80	74		54	50			
College and Career Acceleration		49	53		69	70			
ELP Progress	63	45	55	78	69	70	43		

* 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	650
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	36	Yes	2	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	42			
HSP	57			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	69			
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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	59			
HSP	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%
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	59			

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	56			72			69	79	67			63
SWD	26			42			39	50			5	
ELL	27			63			30		20		5	63
AMI												
ASN	67			89			64				3	
BLK	30			50			53	58			5	
HSP	48			72			51	58	50		7	64
MUL	65			82			75				3	
PAC												
WHT	60			72			75	84	72		6	
FRL	47			65			65	67	60		7	70

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	59	61	51	68	62	49	67	83	72			78
SWD	25	41	39	36	50	42	28	60				
ELL	25	47	45	45	53	42	27	68				78
AMI												
ASN	77	75		90	75							

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
BLK	44	60		53	70			69				
HSP	40	49	30	56	54	45	38	84	73			78
MUL	64	73		76	76		84		80			
PAC												
WHT	62	61	52	70	60	48	69	82	72			
FRL	53	58	50	61	58	46	60	79	53			76

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	57	60	59	62	64	70	67	82	71			43
SWD	27	42	46	33	52	55	31	63				
ELL	31	59	61	30	68	83	50	70				43
AMI												
ASN	67	67		89	67							
BLK	36	50		43	64							
HSP	40	57	58	47	67	86	62	78				41
MUL	65	55		69	61		64					
PAC												
WHT	61	61	61	64	63	64	69	84	75			
FRL	47	52	55	52	63	68	60	74	58			44

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	61%	52%	9%	54%	7%
07	2023 - Spring	50%	48%	2%	47%	3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	54%	48%	6%	47%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	55%	10%	58%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	52%	46%	6%	47%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	47%	-1%	50%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	55%	12%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	53%	2%	48%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	54%	12%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	61%	18%
08	2023 - Spring	79%	61%	18%	55%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	76%	53%	23%	55%	21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	60%	51%	9%	44%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	74%	49%	25%	51%	23%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	57%	39%	50%	46%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	71%	7%	66%	12%

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.

Based on FAST data, we saw the lowest performing groups on PM3 as 3rd grade ELA with 46% proficiency and 7th grade ELA with 49% proficiency. The contributing factors for 3rd grade could be that students take paper-based tests throughout the year, and only take the FAST test three times a year. Another component is that we had many students move in throughout the year, who did not get a full year of instruction but were expected to perform on FAST. These students did not count ultimately, but the number still shows a lower performance.

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

With the test changing from FSA to FAST, it is difficult to compare. However, our math scores schoolwide were higher than ELA, which factors could be adjusting to a new test and newer curriculum. We will not be able to truly track declines in data until we start comparing FAST from 2022-2023 to the current year.

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.

In reviewing previous FSA data, our 5th-grade cohort scored at 48% proficiency versus 56% proficiency in ELA. In reviewing FAST data, only our 3rd grade ELA was lower than the state average by 4 percentage points. It dropped 46% compared to 50%, and it also dropped from the previous year's proficiency scores.

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

In reviewing the most recent FAST data, all but 3rd grade ELA scored above the state average. Although they did make a 26% increase from PM1 to PM2, they were still below the state average. Some of our most significant gains were:

3rd-grade math- 59% increase in proficiency from PM1 to PM3

4th-grade math- 81% increase in proficiency from PM1 to PM3

6th-grade math- 60% increase in proficiency from PM1 to PM3

8th-grade math- 71% increase in proficiency from PM1 to PM3

Although we saw growth in ALL areas from PM1 to PM3, math showed the most significant growth. We did not take any new actions, but we continued to support our PLCs and teachers through professional learning and feedback cycles. This year we are going to provide more focused walkthroughs with specific "look fors" such as, but not limited to: formative assessments, the use of progression scales, student engagement, accountable talk, student grouping, and standards-based instruction.

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

Attendance is always a concern, which ultimately impacts student learning and achievement. Another area of concern is students with suspensions, which is lower than many schools, but it is still missed instruction.

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

- Student engagement
- Feedback cycles
- Formative assessments
- Data Analysis
- Supporting new teachers

We believe that these 5 areas will have the greatest impact on student achievement in the classroom, not just on state testing or progress monitoring. Those are factored in, but we want to ensure that our school is consistent and focused on making the greatest impact in the classroom every day. We will provide professional learning opportunities to focus on student engagement and formative assessments, which will also be supported through classroom walkthroughs and feedback cycles. We also have new teachers who need support, so we have added monthly meetings and check-ins to support them more. PLCs are expected to analyze student data and work in order to identify and meet student needs. Administrators are assigned to grade level and content area PLCs to support teachers. Data chats occur every month, and our intervention teacher leads these meetings. Data is presented to the teachers and administration, and the school psychologist, school counselors, and ESE teachers all participate in discussing our most at-risk students.

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 Students with Disabilities

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 identified by our data, our ESE student population scored 1% lower than the ESSA cutoff on the FSA in 2021-2022. Based on the 2022 FSA data 40% of students identified with a disability met proficiency. This was a decrease from 44% proficient on the 2020-2021 FSA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to increase our scores for our Students with Disabilities over the threshold of 41% based on FAST data.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the PM (1, 2, and 3) scores of our ESE students to identify trends in their data to meet the ESSA standards for proficiency. We will also monitor iReady scores and classroom assessment data to ensure their needs are being met. These students will be discussed in PLC meetings as well as our monthly data chats. We will adjust interventions based on student data to work towards meeting their needs and assessment goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@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.)

Our Students with Disabilities (inclusion, full-time, or a combination) will be served by ESE teachers. Their IEP goals will be met along with their assessments monitored to track their progress. There is an ESE resource teacher for every grade level that is primarily responsible for each student's IEP goals and working with other teachers to provide, and adjust if necessary, accommodations to meet the needs of our Students with Disabilities. These teachers are also present for IEP meetings as well as data chats to ensure that administration, counselors, and intervention teachers are aware of the student's progress. They also work closely with the classroom teachers to meet the needs of the students. We are working on ensuring that all interventions are done by reading-endorsed teachers as well.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Frequently monitoring the progress of our Students with Disabilities through state, district, and classroom assessments, along with other means of progress monitoring, will give the most updated and accurate data to track student progress toward success.

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.

ESE student achievement will be tracked and monitored through classroom assessments, iReady, FAST/STAR, or district-approved progress monitoring. We will also identify student needs through the MTSS process and ensure these students are receiving instruction from a highly qualified teacher. We will also work with our teacher, interventionist, and Resource Teacher to adjust IEP goals if needed.

Person Responsible: Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: We will continue our process throughout the school year and adjust accordingly based on data.

ESE students will be served in a classroom setting that is specific to their needs, and their schedules and interventions will be adjusted based on their achievement and success in their current setting. We offer ASD cluster classes, Full-time VE classes, and inclusion classes. Students may also have a blended schedule based on data such as resource or mainstream for applicable subjects.

Person Responsible: Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Students are scheduled during the summer, but their schedules can change throughout the year based on data- July- May

An ESE resource teacher will be assigned to each grade level to provide IEP assistance to students in the inclusion setting.

Person Responsible: Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: ESE resource teachers are assigned a grade level in August, and they specifically support students only on that grade level.

#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.

Breakfast Point Academy is focused on continuously improving a positive culture and environment through the implementation of the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports System (PBIS).

The number of office discipline referrals decreased across the entire campus (K-8) by 3.43% from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year. Grades K-5 were able to decrease the number of office discipline referrals by 12.09%. However, grades 6-8 increased the number of office discipline referrals by 6.42% at Breakfast Point Academy.

After reviewing school-wide data and meeting with the school's leadership team, adjustments were made to our PBIS system to include crystal clear campus-wide expectations for each administrator, teacher, support staff member, and student at each grade level (K-8) across the campus. We have also implemented a new communication and tracking system school-wide in order to simplify our PBIS system so that it can be more easily implemented across all grade levels, especially in grades 6-8.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, our focus will be to continue building a positive school culture by implementing our Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program.

Our 2022-2023 behavior data shows that there were 675 office discipline referrals in grades K-8, with 327 of them at the elementary level and 348 at the middle school level.

173 of the office discipline referrals were written for Inappropriate Language/Behavior and 153 were written for Defiance/Insubordination. Through careful examination of the discipline data and thoughtful implementation of a school-wide PBIS system, we will be able to better address these specific behaviors and improve the significant loss of instructional time.

During the 2023-2024 school year, there will be a 7% reduction in the number of office discipline referrals for both elementary and middle school.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data is reviewed and discussed as part of the monthly data chats as well as at monthly PBIS committee meetings and Leadership Team meetings. The number of students with discipline referrals, types of infractions, the number of suspension days as well as prescribed interventions for specific students to improve overall discipline are evaluated and discussed at these meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bryan Long (longbh@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.)

Implementation of a Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) system has been proven to improve student outcomes, reduce exclusionary discipline, build a positive school climate, and improve teacher outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is a framework for creating safe, positive, equitable schools, where every student can feel valued, connected to the school community, and supported by caring adults. By implementing evidence-based practices within a PBIS framework, schools support their student's academic, character, and behavioral success, engage with families to create locally-meaningful and culturally-relevant outcomes, and use data to make informed decisions that improve the way things work for everyone at Breakfast Point Academy.

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.

The creation and implementation of a new and updated PBIS tracking and monitoring system.

Person Responsible: Bryan Long (longbh@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: The creation, implementation, and communication of the new PBIS system by August 10, 2023.

The creation of elementary and middle school PBIS teams to regularly plan and communicate.

Person Responsible: Bryan Long (longbh@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: The creation of PBIS teams by August 10, 2023, and then ongoing through May 2024.

Consistent and clear communication of the new and updated PBIS system to all stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Bryan Long (longbh@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly PBIS team meetings through May 2024 and monthly communication of events and reminders for PBIS success to all stakeholders through May 2024.

Regular monitoring and sharing of PBIS data to track successes or future opportunities for growth.

Person Responsible: Bryan Long (longbh@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Tracking and sharing data ongoing through May 2024.

Community support to offset the costs associated with monthly PBIS events to reward successes.

Person Responsible: Angela Carmichael (carmiad@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Gather community support by August 10, 2023, and then ongoing through May 2024.

#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.

The data indicates a strong level of grade-level planning and implementation of quality instruction based on high levels of proficiency. This is especially true in regard to math instruction as each grade level met scored above the state average in all areas but one, 3rd grade ELA. Additionally, BPA saw a decline in the proficiency of students with disabilities. In order to ensure the sustainability of high achievement and to address the identified areas of need, Breakfast Point will continue to create conditions on our campus that guarantee all students achieve at high levels by strengthening and supporting the intentional and systematic implementation of Professional Learning Communities at each grade level and/or subject area. We will continue to target these student's needs through PLCs, classroom walkthroughs, and data chats.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Collaborative data tracking, planning, and implementation of standards-based instruction will lead to an increase in proficiency in ELA and Math as measured by FAST data. We will monitor student proficiency in iReady, STAR, and FAST progress monitoring to set objectives and goals for the next round of progress monitoring. This information will be shared with the teachers through data chats, faculty meetings, and PLC meetings.

Monitoring:

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

In order to ensure that each instructional staff member is involved in collaborative data tracking and instructional planning, an administrator is assigned to PLCs. Additionally, each PLC will submit an agenda and minutes for review. Monthly data chats will be conducted and administration will be in attendance. Student data will be analyzed to monitor student learning on formative and summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@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.)

The structure and function of the Professional Learning Communities are based on the work of Richard and Rebecca Dufour. The PLC is designed to encourage collaboration as teachers analyze student data, plan standards-based instruction and assessment, and develop systematic plans for differentiated instruction based on student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is a plethora of evidence that supports the direct correlation between student achievement and the implementation of Professional Learning Communities. The NBTS issues the following statement in regard to the implementation of PLCs:

The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards was formed to advance the quality of teaching and learning by developing professional standards for accomplished teaching. Its position statement includes the

the following statement: "Proposition 5: Teachers are members of learning communities. NBCTs [National Board Certified Teachers] collaborate with others to improve student learning... They work with other professionals

on instructional policy, curriculum development, and staff development”
(National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2007).

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 teams will be identified before the beginning of school, and training will be provided at in-service on high-functioning PLCs. Support will be provided to PLCs throughout the year with an administrator attending no less than 3 PLC meetings a month. Tuesdays are designated as our schoolwide PLC day, with elementary meetings on common planning and middle school meetings after school.

Person Responsible: Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: This process will be established at the beginning of school and supported throughout the year by all administrators.

PLCs will analyze student work samples no less than once a month at their PLC meetings. This is in addition to analyzing the student data, and the importance of examining work samples is important to understanding student thinking and achievement.

Person Responsible: Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will begin in August and continue through May.

A folder for each PLC will be added to a shared drive for minutes to be added for each meeting. This is the documentation for the administration to ensure PLC schoolwide expectations are being followed.

Person Responsible: Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: The shared drive and folders will be created in July and monitored through May.

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 Schools, 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.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 STAR data, we did not have any grade levels score below 50 percent on the PM3:

K- 64%
1- 57%
2- 60%

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, we are not only going to focus on increasing the proficiency of our 3rd-grade students but also the 4th-grade students who were 3rd graders last year. Currently, our 4th-grade students are at 33% proficiency according to PM1, which is comparable to 21% for their PM1 in 2022. Our teachers use standards-based instruction and curriculum in our classrooms, and we monitor and support instruction through targeted feedback cycles and high-functioning PLCs. We will continue to use iReady data, as well as classroom formative and summative data to track student progress in the area of ELA.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Based on STAR data, we did not have any grade levels score below 50 percent on the PM3:

K- 64%
1- 57%
2- 60%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on FAST data, one of our grade levels scored below 50% proficiency on the PM3:

3rd- 46%

We will track this cohort of students into the 4th grade, and we want to see at least a 4% increase to 50% proficiency but we are looking to make an increase to 54%.

Our current 3rd grade PM1 scores show 24% proficiency, which is 4% points higher than 3rd grade PM1 scores in 2022, which were 20%.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Everyone will be involved in monitoring our Area of Focus for our students: administration, teachers, intervention teachers, and any related support staff. We will ensure that our identified students are getting targeted instruction and interventions specific to their needs. This will be done through whole and small-group instruction, interventions when necessary, and frequent monitoring of student progress to meet the desired outcome of ELA proficiency. Classroom walkthroughs and feedback cycles will be continuous throughout the year, and data will be collected for administration and the Leadership Team to discuss and identify needed adjustments. Our feedback cycles collect data through a Google form, and we look at it monthly to determine trends. This is outside of the mandated evaluations and we will also incorporate school-wide learning walks among grade levels and content areas.

Each month, our Leadership Team meets, and we discuss important school data, and we are transparent with that data. We also have reading-endorsed teachers to provide intensive interventions through targeted, small-group instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Whitfield, Clint , whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

Breakfast Point Academy creates a master schedule to ensure 90 uninterrupted minutes of reading for all grade levels. Within this 90-minute reading block, standards-based instruction is provided based on state-approved curriculum. In addition, ESE teachers push in to provide support to our ESSA subgroup

of ESE students who did not meet the threshold of 41%. Our ESE teachers for 3rd and 4th grade are both reading endorsed, as well as two 3rd and one 4th grade teacher being reading endorsed. Our elementary intervention teacher also holds a reading endorsement. The iReady personalized path is used to provide specific academic paths for students, and our teachers utilize that to create groups and adjust instruction as needed.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Our evidence-based programs are designed to meet the needs of our students to increase ELA proficiency. Our reading-endorsed teachers provide intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening. Our curriculum is standards-based, and our teachers are certified in their respective grade levels. Utilizing iReady and its tools, along with differentiated instruction to meet the individual needs of the students is essential to impact the targeted population.

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
As a Universally Identified RAISE school, our school will utilize the tools and resources offered to us by the Florida Department of Education.	Whitfield, Clint , whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us
Through the use of classroom walkthroughs and attending PLCs, administrators will work together to ensure that formative and summative assessments are standards-based and that adjustments to instruction are being made through the use of data collected.	Whitfield, Clint , whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us
Monthly professional learning opportunities will be provided by administrators, with a focus on areas to impact student achievement: student engagement, formative assessment, progression scales, etc. Administration will also ensure teachers have opportunities for district-provided professional learning and any other opportunities that arise throughout the year.	Long, Bryan, longbh@bay.k12.fl.us