

Bay District Schools

Bay High School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
| School Information | 4 |
| Needs Assessment | 7 |
| Planning for Improvement | 10 |
| Title I Requirements | 11 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 13 |

Bay High School

1200 HARRISON AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| High School 9-12 | Yes | 73% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 50% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | C | C | A* |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridaCIMS.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to provide opportunities and curriculum that are relevant and rigorous so that students demonstrate academic excellence, career readiness, and social sensitivity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a strong academic and collegial atmosphere which allows every student to become a transformational leader.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title |
|------------------|---------------------------|
| May, Billy | Principal |
| Palfrey, Kris | Assistant Principal |
| Wiggins, Pam | Teacher, K-12 |
| Rutherford, Jan | Teacher, K-12 |
| Rogers, Jennifer | Instructional Coach |
| Shanklin, Stacey | Teacher, Career/Technical |
| Todd, Megan | Teacher, K-12 |
| Laird, Leanne | Teacher, K-12 |
| Fowler, Cindy | Teacher, K-12 |
| Jones, Lisa | Assistant Principal |
| Craft, Barbara | Assistant Principal |

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

All administrators serve as instructional leaders in the oversight of all departments, providing necessary resources so that the mission and vision are accomplished. All instructional leaders aid in building the capacity of teacher leaders to ensure that curriculum, instructional, and socio-emotional goals are accomplished.

Billy May, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making and ensures that the school-based team is implementing necessary programs and district initiatives. He also ensures that necessary professional development is available for all stakeholders and oversees the Science and Foreign Language Dept.

Kris Palfrey, Assistant Principal: Oversees the Title 1 Budget, Math and ESE Dept. Ensures that necessary resources and professional development opportunities are provided for stakeholders.

Lisa Jones, Assistant Principal: Oversees and monitors the SIP process and team to ensure that the goals developed by Bay High stakeholders support the mission and vision, as well as oversees the Reading/ELA Dept.

General Ed. Teachers: Megan Todd (Reading, ELA Liaison), Leanne Laird (Math), Pam Wiggins (Science), Cindy Fowler (Social Studies) Stacey Shanklin (Career/Technical) : These general education representatives provide information about core instruction, participate in making sure that Tier 1 instruction is being implemented and student data is collected and analyzed. If needed, they will collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/ instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. These also serve as leads for PLC's.

Jennifer Moses, Literacy Coach: Identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches and provides this literature for the faculty. Assists with whole school screening programs, assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; models for instructional staff when necessary, and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Ms. Moses is also assigned to work with new teachers in all content areas regarding ELA/Writing practices.

Barbara Smiley, serves as the administrator over the Guidance Dept. and ensures that are underserved and first-generation students have access to vital tools to reach all possible post-high school options. Ms. Smiley communicates with various stakeholders to ensure that our faculty and staff have necessary professional development, resulting in more effective instruction and positive relationships.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 16 | 17 | 10 | 77 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 71 | 39 | 54 | 274 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 48 | 69 | 43 | 187 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 120 | 85 | 67 | 388 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 37 | 40 | 0 | 108 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 14 | 8 | 1 | 38 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 14 |

Date this data was collected

Friday 6/1/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 71 | 47 | 140 | 332 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 32 | 16 | 13 | 109 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 68 | 47 | 44 | 193 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 97 | 70 | 3 | 277 |
| | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 75 | 43 | 37 | 223 |

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 71 | 47 | 140 | 332 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 32 | 16 | 13 | 109 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 68 | 47 | 44 | 193 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 97 | 70 | 3 | 277 |
| | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 75 | 43 | 37 | 223 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA lowest 25%. While this percentage increased from last year, it does trend as the lowest performing category.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Overall content areas improved, but the specific category that showed a decline was Language & Editing (9th).

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

ELA lowest 25%, which had a -13% gap.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Math lowest 25% learning gains showed the most improvement, but this isn't a trend.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Algebra 1 was divided into a two year series, therefore providing an additional year of Algebra 1 curriculum before these students test.

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 46% | 55% | 56% | 41% | 51% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 42% | 50% | 53% | 42% | 46% | 46% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 31% | 37% | 44% | 34% | 33% | 38% |
| Math Achievement | 51% | 61% | 51% | 38% | 54% | 43% |
| Math Learning Gains | 56% | 62% | 48% | 37% | 48% | 39% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | 59% | 45% | 36% | 46% | 38% |
| Science Achievement | 56% | 67% | 67% | 58% | 65% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 70% | 74% | 71% | 63% | 72% | 69% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|
| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 34 (74) | 16 (71) | 17 (47) | 10 (140) | 77 (332) |
| One or more suspensions | 110 (48) | 71 (32) | 39 (16) | 54 (13) | 274 (109) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 27 (34) | 48 (68) | 69 (47) | 43 (44) | 187 (193) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 116 (107) | 120 (97) | 85 (70) | 67 (3) | 388 (277) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 09 | 2018 | 41% | 54% | -13% | 53% | -12% |
| | 2017 | 42% | 51% | -9% | 52% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2018 | 46% | 52% | -6% | 53% | -7% |
| | 2017 | 39% | 48% | -9% | 50% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 56% | 64% | -8% | 65% | -9% |
| 2017 | 56% | 65% | -9% | 63% | -7% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2017 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 67% | 73% | -6% | 68% | -1% |
| 2017 | 67% | 73% | -6% | 67% | 0% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 66% | 64% | 2% | 62% | 4% |
| 2017 | 24% | 62% | -38% | 60% | -36% |
| Compare | | 42% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 45% | 62% | -17% | 56% | -11% |
| 2017 | 40% | 60% | -20% | 53% | -13% |
| Compare | | 5% | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 23 | 29 | 18 | 25 | 53 | | 28 | 73 | | 67 | 25 |
| ELL | 3 | 20 | 25 | 23 | 60 | | 21 | | | 45 | |
| ASN | 69 | 36 | | | | | | | | 100 | 90 |
| BLK | 26 | 36 | 31 | 28 | 47 | 40 | 34 | 53 | | 67 | 57 |
| HSP | 32 | 35 | 26 | 51 | 65 | | 35 | 54 | | 68 | 71 |
| MUL | 46 | 53 | | 62 | 56 | | 58 | 67 | | 87 | 75 |
| WHT | 57 | 45 | 31 | 64 | 58 | 63 | 69 | 82 | | 84 | 78 |
| FRL | 37 | 38 | 27 | 41 | 51 | 43 | 44 | 61 | | 70 | 65 |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 18 | 32 | 32 | 16 | 25 | 23 | 31 | 48 | | 59 | 37 |
| ELL | 15 | 27 | 32 | 17 | 21 | 13 | 38 | | | 80 | |
| ASN | | | | 38 | 27 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 22 | 17 | 21 | 33 | 25 | 36 | 42 | | 78 | 57 |
| HSP | 23 | 26 | 33 | 27 | 31 | 20 | 48 | 45 | | 90 | 72 |
| MUL | 42 | 29 | | 34 | 28 | 40 | 58 | 73 | | 92 | 58 |

| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| WHT | 56 | 45 | 38 | 47 | 40 | 41 | 70 | 84 | | 85 | 84 |
| FRL | 31 | 31 | 26 | 29 | 32 | 26 | 48 | 56 | | 77 | 67 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title Excessive Tardy Referrals

Rationale If students are in class on time this decreases the opportunities for inappropriate behaviors and increases time on task.

Intended Outcome A decrease in tardy referrals by 10% thereby increasing instruction

Point Person Barbara Craft (craftba@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description

1. Implement Bay High Red Pride program (PBIS).
 - a. 8th period
 - b. Tornado grams: Teachers will select 5 students every 9 wks, that have demonstrated appropriate attendance and send the gram home.
 - c. Pep Rally: Students will be recognized for appropriate attendance and receive a prize
 - d. Grade level competition: Competition between content areas- winning class gets pizza party.
2. Redeliver PD regarding MIF (Minor Infraction Form- Teacher Managed vs Office Managed).
3. Tardy Round ups

Person Responsible Barbara Craft (craftba@bay.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

- Monthly PLC minutes (8th period)
- Student Centered Activities monitored via school calendar(Pep Rallys)
- Tornado grams (turned in to Palfrey / postage)
- Student survey
- FOCUS report (# of tardies)

Person Responsible Barbara Craft (craftba@bay.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2

Title Increase Reading Proficiency

Rationale Our lowest performing area was ELA learning gains for our lowest 25% . Currently we have 318 Lv 1 students. Academic success in reading is imperative if students are to accomplish academic excellence in all content areas, leading to increasing their FSA scores, and laying a very strong foundation leading to college and career ready. Our goal is to provide necessary professional development in close reading, student feedback, and cultural sensitivity, so that our teachers become equipped with the necessary strategies to foster increased academic achievement.

Intended Outcome To improve student reading proficiency levels by 10% as measured by MAP, FSA, and district created summative assessments by end of SY 2018-19

Point Person Lisa Jones (joneslm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description

1. Literacy coach will provide Close Reading PD and model the implementation of Close Reading for teachers in all content areas with an emphasis on reading, social studies and science.
2. Teachers will focus on L25% (2 students in each of the 6 sections of instruction)
3. Dorina Sackman (district resource person) will provide continuing PD for teachers concerning ELL students.

Person Responsible Jennifer Rogers (rogerjo@bay.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

1. Literacy coach will provide teachers with close reading pd with the expectation that the strategy be implemented. ELA Admin and Lit Coach will work closely together
 - sign in sheets
 - CWT's
2. Students will produce a writing piece after close read

Person Responsible Jennifer Rogers (rogerjo@bay.k12.fl.us)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

Bay High School seeks to have parental involvement in all areas of student activities, both curricular and co-curricular. Our target is to make known to parents the benefits of participation and support of their students. This is done through regular updates to the Bay High School website and on-line calendar, IRIS alerts, a quarterly newsletter, Bay High School Facebook page, Bay High School's Twitter account, and Remind101 for seniors.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Currently, Bay High School employs 3 full-time guidance counselors, 1 ESE Coordinator, 1 Military Liaison Counselor, 1 Gulf Coast State College liaison counselor, Title 1 Parent Liaison, and maintains a longstanding relationship with the district's Homeless Student Advocate. Because Bay High School recognizes the needs of our students, our utmost emphasis is placed on relationship building with our students.

Additionally, the GCSC Trio Program provides support for our low socio-economic students to ensure these students have the same opportunities for post-secondary education as our other students. The Title 1 Parent Liaison will oversee a student clothes and personal needs closet. Guidance counselors will work in concert with the liaison to insure that all resources are vetted for these students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

For ESE students, transition meetings are held at the 8th grade middle school level to meet with the students and parents of all ESE students transitioning to Bay High School. The IEP team/service providers meet to discuss the service models Bay High School provides to meet the educational and service needs of each student.

For all incoming 9th graders, counselors go to each middle school to register the students for freshman courses at Bay High School. Students from different programs (academic, ROTC, extracurricular) go on the same day to share their experiences and answer questions.

During the week before school begins, Freshman and New Student Orientation is held at Bay High School. Different clubs set up information booths; freshmen are given schedules and tours; freshmen level teachers are available to answer questions; and different school supplies are sold.

For seniors, several programs are provided by Bay High School to help with college applications and financial aid, such as AICE College Night, GCSC College Night, FAFSA Workshop, and individual college admissions officers visits. For students looking to transition into careers, BHS students participate in Career Connections at GCSC.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The Bay Leadership Team will focus on how to develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our school, our teachers and in our students. The Bay Leadership Team will meet at least 3 times per year to engage in the following activities: Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources.

The MTSS Leadership Team will also meet monthly to problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. Additionally, representatives of the MTSS Leadership Team will meet with subject area teams to effectively and efficiently implement and coordinate problem-solving and MTSS across school plans and initiatives.

The Advanced International Certificate of Education programs earn money to support the purchase of supplies, professional development, technology, testing supplies and tests for support of continued student achievement.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

The school offers students elective courses in art, band, chorus, journalism, physical education, culinary operations, law enforcement, technology, health occupations, career study, and several dual enrolled course options. Courses are added at student request and advanced courses are designed to further core knowledge in many areas. Every year, after FSA/EOC testing, students and parents participate in a course selection activity entitled "Counting Down to College and Career" that exposes them to course offerings and provide relevant information for a students's course selection. After the program "Counting Down to College and Career," students meet one-on-one with a counselor to decide what classes will be taken. Emphasis is placed on curriculums that allow students to earn one of the three Florida Bright Futures scholarship opportunities. Parents are invited to these meetings; if parents are unable to participate in the meeting, they are asked to sign the student's course selection card to ensure parental participation.

Dual Enrollment opportunities are provided to Bay High School Students, on the Bay High School, GCSC, and FSU-PCC campuses. Students are encouraged to participate in GCSC College Night, GCSC Scholarship Night, and other events GCSC hosts. A new course is offered for College Readiness. This course targets students who are the first generation of their families to attend college.

The different branches of the military are invited to present their opportunities to the students in ROTC and others interested.

Part V: Budget

| | |
|---------------|---------------------|
| Total: | \$102,426.00 |
|---------------|---------------------|