

Bay District Schools

Deer Point 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Deer Point Elementary School

4800 HIGHWAY 2321, Panama City, FL 32404

[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.

Deer Point Elementary will work collaboratively to ensure the success of all students and staff through engaging, rigorous, and relevant learning activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Deer Point Anglers are respectful, independent and responsible leaders.

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
Reeder, Rebecca	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
Hobbs, Amy	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.
Hood, Sheila	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
Register, Roxanne	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
Redmon, Pam	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
Dagen, Elizabeth	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.

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, and media specialist. This team collaborated to analyze and reflect on schoolwide data. The team identified specific areas of focus and developed a plan for improvement. A school climate survey was conducted at the end of the school year to allow stakeholders such as students, staff and parents an opportunity to provide feedback. Through this survey, areas of progress as well as need were identified.

Moving forward, the School Advisory Council (SAC) will assist by reviewing the draft of the plan, providing feedback, and approving the final revisions. Additionally, the school improvement plan is revisited and discussed by the SAC and the administration throughout the school 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))

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 and will include the school based interventionist, teachers, administration, guidance and school psychologist. During these chats, we will aim to monitor and evaluate the achievement of students with the greatest achievement gap. Implementation and effectiveness of instructional strategies will also be monitored through classroom walkthroughs. Our team focus will be to continuously collaborate to disaggregate and analyze data in order to monitor the impact of the strategies for improvement. Through this process we will be able to identify areas in need of additional resources or revision and will take the needed steps in order to achieve the intended student growth. We plan to routinely revisit and discuss the school improvement plan in SAC meetings with administration throughout the school year.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	23%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
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)* 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: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
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	20	38	30	32	32	32	0	0	0	184	
One or more suspensions	2	16	17	10	10	14	0	0	0	69	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	6	3	12	4	3	0	0	0	28	
Course failure in Math	0	5	1	5	1	6	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	9	14	0	0	0	60	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	10	7	14	13	17	0	0	0	62

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	11	4	6	3	1	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	29	35	32	30	19	19	0	0	0	164	
One or more suspensions	0	10	8	3	6	10	0	0	0	37	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	4	1	3	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	7	23	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	11	20	0	0	0	39	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	0	9	8	16	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	4	3	12	3	0	0	0	0	27
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	29	35	32	30	19	19	0	0	0	164	
One or more suspensions	0	10	8	3	6	10	0	0	0	37	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	4	1	3	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	7	23	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	11	20	0	0	0	39	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	0	9	8	16	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	4	3	12	3	0	0	0	0	27
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*	42	47	53	54	51	56	49		
ELA Learning Gains				60			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			55		
Math Achievement*	53	50	59	50	48	50	55		
Math Learning Gains				41			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				23			38		
Science Achievement*	49	48	54	41	50	59	51		
Social Studies Achievement*					54	64			
Middle School Acceleration					42	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		56	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	189
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	315
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	16	Yes	4	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	42			
MUL	52			
PAC				

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%
WHT	48			
FRL	41			

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	47			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	42			53			49					
SWD	17			23			8				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			48							3	
HSP	42			42							2	

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
MUL	45			59							2	
PAC												
WHT	44			54			47				4	
FRL	36			45			43				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	54	60	46	50	41	23	41					
SWD	23	46	42	20	30	26	21					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	55		44	55							
HSP	44			50								
MUL	41	71		45	36							
PAC												
WHT	57	58	40	52	38	23	43					
FRL	42	56	42	41	37	25	29					

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	49	46	55	55	54	38	51					
SWD	25	27	42	27	32	18	24					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			69								
HSP	42			50								
MUL	53			47								
PAC												
WHT	51	45	53	55	56	33	58					

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
FRL	37	38		47	42	47	38					

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	49%	52%	-3%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
03	2023 - Spring	42%	47%	-5%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	54%	-1%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	59%	-6%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	53%	0%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	49%	-2%	51%	-4%

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 component with the lowest performance was 3rd grade reading proficiency. 43% of third grade students scored a Level 3 or higher. This is a 16 point decrease for the same grade from 2021-22. From PM1 to PM3, the third grade reading proficiency increased by 28 percentage points. There were 32 (27%) students in third grade that had an attendance rate of lower than 90%. Staffing challenges resulted in higher than optimal class size for third grade. Ten students had 1 or more suspensions. Third grade students were the largest grade level in grades K-5. Twelve students had a course failure in third grade ELA.

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

Third grade reading showed the greatest decline from the 2021-22. There were 32 (27%) students in third grade that had an attendance rate of lower than 90%. Staffing challenges resulted in higher than optimal class size for third grade. Ten students had 1 or more suspensions. Third grade students were the largest grade level in grades K-5. Twelve students had a course failure in third grade ELA.

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 component with the greatest gap in comparison to the state average was 4th grade reading. There was a gap of 13 percentage points between the school and state performance level. Although data for the school was below the state average in all component areas, the gap was less than 10 points with the exception of 4th grade reading.

30% of the 4th grade students had an attendance rate of less than 90%. Additionally, ten students received one or more suspensions. Four students had a course failure in 4th grade ELA.

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

Fifth grade math showed the most improvement from the 2021-22 school year. There was a 19 percentage point increase in this data component. Although this is a significant improvement from the previous 5th grade math scores, it actually represents a 10 percentage point decline when looking at cohort data.

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

The number of students (28%) who missed 10% or more of the school year is a potential area of concern across all grade levels. The number of students with multiple EWS indicators is another area of potential concern.

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

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

Area of Focus

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Deer Point Elementary's Early Warning System data indicates that approximately 28% of the student population was absent 10% or more of the school days during the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Deer Point Elementary will decrease the percentage of students absent 10% or more of the school days by 10% in the 2023-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The attendance report will be reviewed monthly to identify students demonstrating a pattern of non-attendance. Parent liaison will monitor daily attendance and reach out to parents and students to provide support for improving student attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Hobbs (hobbsas@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.)

Deer Point Elementary will create positive conditions for learning by being intentional in building strong and supportive relationships among all stakeholders. The school's parent liaison will work with the CARE team to assist with providing families with the resources needed to help get their child to school daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates that attendance improves when schools engage students and parents in positive ways (attendanceworks.org).

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.

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

Person Responsible: Amy Hobbs (hobbsas@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing throughout the school year

Monitor attendance daily and assist in connecting families to resources within the community to remove or reduce factors currently impeding attendance.

Person Responsible: Amy Hobbs (hobbsas@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: daily and ongoing throughout the school year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Deer Point Elementary School's faculty will actively participate as a member of a school-based high-functioning Professional Learning Community. The 22-23 schoolwide ELA proficiency levels are below the state average.

state averages in grades 3, 4, and 5. The 22-23 school-wide math proficiency levels were also below the the state average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of the faculty at Deer Point Elementary School will be a member of the Professional Learning Community and actively participate in weekly PLC meetings.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Reeder (reederl@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.)

PLCs will focus on delivering benchmark-aligned engaging lessons, planning for effective interventions for struggling learners, and analyzing student achievement data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to The U.S. Department of Education Institute of Educational Sciences, Professional Learning Communities foster teacher learning, add coherence and continuous learning to professional development and improves the professional culture of the school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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

Person Responsible: Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

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

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

Person Responsible: Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: The agenda will be uploaded at least 24 hours in advance of the upcoming meeting. The minutes will be uploaded weekly to the grade-level shared Google Drive.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

Deer Point Elementary's FAST ELA achievement proficiency in grades 3-5 for the 22-23 school below the state percentage. The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher is as follows:

3rd Grade: 42% compared to the state's 50%

4th Grade: 44% compared to the state's 57%

5th Grade: 50% compared to the state's 55%

Measurable Outcome:

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

It is the vision of Deer Point Elementary that 100% of our students will be at or above grade level. In order to work towards this vision, at least 54% of our students in grades 3-5, including the identified low-performing ESSA subgroups, SWD and ED, will score a Level 3 or higher this school year as measured by the State ELA FAST PM3 assessment administered in May.

Monitoring:

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

The data from the FAST PM1 and PM2 will be analyzed to monitor progress. The iReady diagnostic will be administered in the Fall and Winter and utilized as an instructional tool to monitor progress, plan for instruction, and plan for appropriate interventions. PLCs will review student work samples, formative assessments, and district-common summative assessments frequently to track student progress. MTSS Tier 3 progress monitoring data will be reviewed monthly to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 3 interventions. Classroom walkthrough data will be utilized to monitor instruction and student progress. Students will track their individual progress and participate in teacher-student data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Reeder (reederl@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.)

Deer Point Elementary will implement the district-adopted Houghton Mifflin Harcourt curriculum with fidelity during the 90-minute uninterrupted reading block. We will schedule an additional 45 minutes of small group reading instruction daily to provide supplemental support to master grade-level essential benchmarks utilizing approved resources as outlined in Bay District Schools Comprehensive Reading Plan. K-3 classrooms will use a portion of the daily small group time to focus on direct phonics instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need extra support in order to master grade-level benchmarks. By creating a dedicated 45-minute intervention time, we will be able to address gaps in student learning. The What Works Clearinghouse practice guides indicate that there is strong evidence related to delivering evidence-based reading interventions based on student's needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Develop a master schedule that includes a 45-minute small group instruction block for grades K-5.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

Teachers in grades K-5 will use iReady Diagnostic 1 to determine student needs and assign iReady lessons based on the data. As well as utilize iReady teacher toolbox lessons for small group

Person Responsible: Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When:

In addition to the monthly data chats, Administration and academic interventions will participate in monthly data chats focused on identifying students in need of Tier 2 ELA interventions.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When:

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.

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 the 2022-23 statewide ELA STAR Assessment the following are the percentage of students who scored below the proficiency level.

In Kindergarten, 28% of students are below the proficiency level.

In 1st Grade, 46% of students are below the proficiency level

In 2nd Grade, 43% of students are below the proficiency level

For each grade level, we will focus on strategic intervention as students are identified through the problem-solving process of MTSS and small-group differentiated instruction. Additionally, we will have 45 minutes of ELA intervention blocked on our Master Schedule.

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

Based on the 2022-23 statewide ELA FAST Assessment the following are the percent of students who scored below proficiency (Level 3).

In 3rd Grade, 57% of students scored Level 1 or Level 2 on PM3 ELA FAST

In 4th Grade, 56% of students scored Level 1 or Level 2 on PM3 ELA FAST

In 5th Grade, 51% of students scored Level 1 or Level 2 on PM3 ELA FAST

For each grade level, we will focus on strategic intervention as students are identified through the problem-solving process of MTSS and small-group differentiated instruction. Additionally, we will have 45 minutes of ELA intervention blocked on our Master Schedule.

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

In each grade, the percentage of students who are not on track to pass the Statewide ELA Assessment is less than 50%.

For each grade level, we will focus on strategic intervention as students are identified through the problem-solving process of MTSS and small-group differentiated instruction. Additionally, we will have 45 minutes of ELA intervention blocked on our Master Schedule.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the 2022-23 statewide ELA FAST Assessment the following are the percent of students who scored below proficiency (Level 3).

In 3rd Grade, 57% of students scored Level 1 or Level 2 on PM3 ELA FAST. We will decrease that number to 49% by May 2024.

In 4th Grade, 56% of students scored Level 1 or Level 2 on PM3 ELA FAST. We will decrease that number to 49% by May 2024.

In 5th Grade, 51% of students scored Level 1 or Level 2 on PM3 ELA FAST. We will decrease that number to 49% by May 2024.

For each grade level, we will focus on strategic intervention as students are identified through the problem-solving process of MTSS and small-group differentiated instruction. Additionally, we will have 45 minutes of ELA intervention blocked on our Master Schedule.

For each grade level, we will focus on strategic intervention as students are identified through the problem-solving process of MTSS and small-group differentiated instruction. Additionally, we will have 45 minutes of ELA intervention blocked on our Master Schedule.

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.

For each grade level, we will focus on strategic intervention as students are identified through the problem-solving process of MTSS and small-group differentiated instruction. Additionally, we will have 45 minutes of ELA intervention blocked on our Master Schedule.

This area of focus will be monitored through standards-based formative and summative assessments, iReady Diagnostic Assessments, and the Florida Progress Monitoring FAST Assessments. Grade-level PLCs along with administration will conduct monthly data chats to review data and ongoing progress related to TIER I instruction along with student progress receiving TIER II and TIER III interventions. Individual student data will be tracked using our HPE Universal Data Spreadsheet for each grade level.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Reeder, Rebecca, reederl@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?

Bay County has adopted a state-approved ELA Curriculum, HMH, which is correlated with BEST Standards. This curriculum is designed to provide quality instruction through a gradual release model starting with whole group lessons and then allowing students to interact with the text and practice the skills in small group and individualized standards-based activities. In addition, the curriculum includes Table Top lessons designed to differentiate instruction in small groups and enables grade-level texts to be accessible to all learners (ELL and ESE students).

Along with the implementation of the HMH curriculum, students’ progress will also be monitored through iReady. Students will participate in diagnostic assessments in Fall, Winter, and Spring. This diagnostic data will be used to identify students who need additional support and interventions. Students will be assigned individualized lessons to address learning deficits and provide instruction on pre-requisite skills necessary to master grade-level standards.

Rationale:

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?

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Into Reading core adopted instructional materials for K-5 English Language Arts. The series was reviewed and approved by the FLDOE for inclusion on the State Adopted List at the time of adoption and purchase. To improve instruction and learning, BDS teachers incorporate explicit,

direct instruction (effect size of .60) and scaffolding (effect size of .82) based on Hattie's research (Visible Learning: John Hattie 2017).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1. All new teachers will be provided the opportunity to participate in Houghton Mifflin Harcourt training through HMH. Additionally, returning staff will receive targeted professional development facilitated by district ELA Instructional Specialists. This series of training will guide teachers in the implementation of the standards-based curriculum. Our Literacy Regional Director will also provide professional development and resources to address particular areas of need based on progress monitoring data.	Reeder, Rebecca, reederl@bay.k12.fl.us
1. All new teachers will be provided the opportunity to participate in Houghton Mifflin Harcourt training through HMH. Additionally, returning staff will receive targeted professional development facilitated by district ELA Instructional Specialists. This series of training will guide teachers in the implementation of the standards-based curriculum. Our Literacy Regional Director will also provide professional development and resources to address particular areas of need based on progress monitoring data.	Reeder, Rebecca, reederl@bay.k12.fl.us
4. For any student who has not responded to a specific reading intervention delivered with fidelity and with the initial intensity provided (time and group size), reading intervention instruction and/or materials may be changed based on student data. Diagnostic assessments will be required to identify specific needs (areas of strengths and weaknesses.) Further, schools are supported by district MTSS Staff Training Specialists and meet monthly to review student data, progress, and intervention materials. Additionally, schools follow the Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan and MTSS decision tree which indicates research-based and evidence-based materials available for targeted interventions (Tier 2). If student data does not show progress at Tier 2 then adjustments will be made (teacher: student ratio; time in intervention; intervention materials; instruction).	Reeder, Rebecca, reederl@bay.k12.fl.us

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

School Improvement Plans are made publicly available via the Florida Department of Education, CIMS website: <https://www.floridacims.org/plans>. This link is available for parents and the community on the school's webpage <https://deerpoint.bay.k12.fl.us>. The yearly BDS Title I Newsletter will provide the CIMS link to the SIP/SWP, which contains the UniSIG budget. The newsletter is translated into the language parents can understand and distributed to parents via PeachJar. Paper copies of the plan are provided upon request. Monthly family newsletters provide information about the location of the SIP and/or updates to the plan. The plan is sent home via PeachJar and sent via email in Parent Portal. The SIP/ SWP will be discussed at the Title I Annual Meeting and during SAC meetings. The SAC will progress monitor the implementation of the plan.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

With the input of parents, a Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) has been developed for the 23-24 school year and a summary of the PFEP is disseminated electronically to parents at the beginning of the year. The PFEP outlines the meetings, workshops, and communications planned to engage parents, build parents' capacity in order to be fully involved in their child's education, meet their child's needs, and increase academic achievement; which will fulfill the school's mission. It also outlines the training for teachers, administrators, and other staff to promote positive relationships with parents. The PFEP is available on the school's website at <https://deerpoint.bay.k12.fl.us>. Parents are able to monitor their child's progress 24/7 using the Parent Portal. The following Title I expenditures will support the implementation of the PFEP:

- a parent liaison;
- parent communications;
- materials for parents to work with their children at home;
- parent workshops (refreshments and supplies);

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

At Deer Point Elementary, we utilize rigorous instruction and productive PLCs to guide our faculty to help our students reach their achievement goals. Our job is to maintain instructional momentum and as such we use Title 1 funds such as 8 classroom paraprofessionals, educational field trips, and instructional supplies to enhance and engage instruction. These resources allow us to focus on teaching quality curriculum and enhancing the quality of instruction by not only maintaining instructional momentum but providing hands-on instruction and creating core memories for our students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Title II and local funds provide ongoing professional development for teachers and administrators to support the implementation of best practices for continuous improvement, ensure that instructional practices and strategies align with the rigorous state standards, and promote accelerated learning and differentiated instruction to meet students' individual needs. Funds provide opportunities for teachers to add endorsements for Autism, Reading, ESOL, and Gifted as well as obtaining certification for critical shortage areas. New teachers are provided sustained support from staff training specialists and content area instructional specialists to facilitate their development.

The State's mental health allocation is coordinated with ESSER/ARP funds to provide the school with a mental health team to provide equitable access to behavioral support services within the school, addressing barriers to academic and social success, while enhancing students' emotional development, well-being and safety through the multi-tiered systems of support within the school.

Title IX, Part A funds provide social workers, student support care managers, and intervention teachers to work with students who have been identified as homeless to remove barriers that prevent regular attendance, full participation, and academic success.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Ongoing professional development is provided for teachers and administrators to support the implementation of best practices for continuous improvement, ensure that instructional practices and strategies align with the rigorous state standards, and promote accelerated learning and differentiated instruction to meet students' individual needs. Funds provide opportunities for teachers to add endorsements for Autism, Reading, ESOL, and Gifted as well as obtaining certification for critical shortage areas. New teachers are provided sustained support from staff training specialists and content area instructional specialists to facilitate their development.

Title I funds support professional development by providing additional planning during the summer for the leadership team; additional staff members to participate in leadership meetings during the school year who are then required to share information to appointed staff; and providing training on Leader in Me, the character education program used school-wide.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

n/a

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

In the spring, the school will conduct a Pre-K to Kindergarten Workshop for parents of preschool children. Invitations will be given to childcare centers within the school's zone. It will be advertised throughout the community via social media. During the meetings, parents will be given resources for their preschool child to work on during the summer to prepare them for kindergarten; information about the curriculum that will be used; assessments; behavior expectations; and information about Parent Portal. Parents will be given a tour of the campus.

Additionally, in the fall, schools hold an Orientation to invite parents and families to visit the school, classroom, and teacher to become more comfortable with the school and to provide opportunities for parents to be involved.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes