J.R. Arnold High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

J.R. Arnold High School

550 N ALF COLEMAN RD, Panama City Beach, FL 32407

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Britt Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 8/7/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.	

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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.

Table of Contents

J.R. Arnold High School

550 N ALF COLEMAN RD, Panama City Beach, FL 32407

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	42%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	A	B	C

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.

The MISSION of Arnold High School is to provide a rigorous educational experience which gives individual students relevant learning while fostering healthy relationships for lifelong success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The VISION of Arnold High School is that every student, every day, in every way will be actively engaged in pursuit of academic excellence to be college and career ready.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Britt	Principal	
McNulty, Kathleen	Teacher, K-12	
Barnes, Antonius	Assistant Principal	
Carmichael, Julie	Assistant Principal	
Bell, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Bethea, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Hurst, Jan	Teacher, K-12	
	SAC Member	
Dunlap, Anji	Administrative Support	
Bauer, Chris	Teacher, K-12	
Birmingham, Matthew	Teacher, K-12	
Green, Dia	Teacher, ESE	
Moore, Jonathon	Assistant Principal	
Garrett, Stephanie	School Counselor	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	424	391	373	345	1533
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	60	51	55	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	52	39	29	192
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	47	42	57	173
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	74	64	46	257

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	61	36	51	213

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	17	19	6	1	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	7	6	35

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

86

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

Prior Year - 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	53	44	49	48	194
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	9	11	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	76	87	63	258
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	69	67	41	246

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	55	63	36	189

Prior Year - 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	53	44	49	48	194
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	9	11	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	76	87	63	258
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	69	67	41	246

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	55	63	36	189

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	57%	56%	58%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	49%	51%	54%	44%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	35%	42%	45%	35%	41%
Math Achievement	47%	58%	51%	52%	58%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	53%	48%	35%	50%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	50%	45%	33%	48%	39%
Science Achievement	67%	74%	68%	74%	68%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	76%	73%	80%	77%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	424 (0)	391 (0)	373 (0)	345 (0)	1533 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	86 (53)	60 (44)	51 (49)	55 (48)	252 (194)
One or more suspensions	72 (10)	52 (9)	39 (9)	29 (11)	192 (39)
Course failure in ELA or Math	27 (32)	47 (76)	42 (87)	57 (63)	173 (258)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	73 (69)	74 (69)	64 (67)	46 (41)	257 (246)

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

NOTE: 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
09	2019	63%	58%	5%	55%	8%
	2018	61%	54%	7%	53%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	47%	53%	-6%	53%	-6%
	2018	54%	52%	2%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

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
2019	66%	71%	-5%	67%	-1%
2018	72%	64%	8%	65%	7%
Compare		-6%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	74%	-3%	70%	1%
2018	79%	73%	6%	68%	11%
Compare		-8%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	64%	-39%	61%	-36%
2018	50%	64%	-14%	62%	-12%
Compare		-25%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	62%	-4%	57%	1%
2018	72%	62%	10%	56%	16%
Compare		-14%			

Subgroup Data

2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	32	31	17	33	33	50	57		86	13
ELL	30	39	42	45	38	18	43			75	
ASN	61	44		75	80		70				
BLK	28	39	50	34	36	38	63	40		71	33
HSP	42	28	20	33	29	8	47	67		86	46
MUL	55	41	17	33	34		63	36		88	57
WHT	59	46	45	51	49	36	69	78		88	67
FRL	51	39	33	39	39	26	61	66		80	48
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	42	41	47	56	50	33	65		79	55
ELL	35	46	47	76	54					50	
ASN	80	64								83	80
BLK	26	43	50	34	36		47	60		73	55
HSP	59	48	35	71	60		76	69		58	60
MUL	54	62	33	66	63		63	75			
WHT	61	56	44	67	62	53	78	83		88	75
FRL	46	47	40	60	63	59	66	72		79	70
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	24	39	41	26	21	16	52	54		77	33
ELL	9	46	40								
ASN	64	50								100	69
BLK	39	53	42	27	24	30	50	68		100	36
HSP	52	58	43	40	29	33	71	73		95	65
MUL	51	55	70	41	25		74	88		95	42
WHT	60	54	44	55	37	34	76	80		89	59
FRL	47	49	39	42	30	25	69	74		88	47

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	614
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	66
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our mathematics scores were our greatest area of challenge last year. This was due in large part to lost instructional time and school location changes due to Hurricane Michael and a shift in our course progression for mathematics.

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

Again mathematics, was our greatest area of challenge. This was due in large part to lost instructional time and school location changes due to Hurricane Michael and a shift in our course progression for mathematics.

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.

Math was our greatest area of difference from state average scores, and we know we need to focus on this. This was due in large part to lost instructional time and school location changes due to Hurricane Michael and a shift in our course progression for mathematics.

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

Students with Disabilities in science achievement were our greatest improvement at 17% growth over the previous year. New science staff received additional training and provided Saturday tutoring and other new opportunities to get students prepared for the EOC.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance is our biggest concern and remains so from year to year.

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

1. Mathematics learning gains (particularly for our Hispanic students)
2. English Language Arts learning gains (particularly for our students with disabilities)
3. Providing push in and pull out support for struggling students (especially ESE and ELL)
4. Improving attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lowest 25% Students
Rationale	Our school report card on Edudata.fldoe.org shows that we have great improvements to make in the area of English Language Arts. We know that each teacher must address English Language Arts standards through their areas and that English teachers need additional support.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will have a learning gain for each tested student from our population in the lowest 25% of ELA scores from 2018-2019 to the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Terry Hagler (hagletc@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Push in and pull out support for struggling students, especially those among the lowest quartile, including by ELL, ESE staff, learning lab opportunities, and other teacher designed differentiated instructional practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Journal of Special Education reports that combined services models such as push in and pull out support from a fully inclusive classroom for students with mild disabilities shows the best student progress. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/002246699603000201 This journal also reports that students served in inclusion classrooms with support achieve higher grades and feel overall more successful. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/002246699603000201 These strategies would work for any student and can be differentiated to support all lowest quartile students.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify students in the lowest 25% of ELA scores overall 2. Identify what score is needed to show a gain for these students 3. Common planning as much as possible for teachers working with this group of students 4. Each teacher, regardless of subject, knows who among their students falls within this target group 5. All teachers, regardless of subject, will support ELA instruction 6. Our school report card on Edudata.fldoe.org shows that students with disabilities among the lowest quartile of student scores had one of the lowest levels of learning gains last year, particularly when compared to the whole school's gains in ELA. We feel it's important to directly address this demographic with new supports and focus. Build a schedule for ESE support staff to push in and pull out. 7. Administrative walk-throughs to support teacher implementation of the plan, as monitored by Google survey completed at each walk-through observation. The strategies and processes supported in this include items like posting learning objectives and standards daily, having progress monitoring opportunities for students to get feedback, and common lesson planning and pacing. 8. Professional Learning Communities of teachers meet once a week to develop, plan, implement, and monitor common assessments.

Person Responsible Britt Smith (smithjb@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Lowest 25%
Rationale	Our school report card on Edudata.fldoe.org shows that students among the lowest quartile of student scores had one of the lowest levels of learning gains last year. We feel it's important to directly address this demographic with new supports and focus.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Arnold High School will have a learning gain for each student from our lowest 25% of math scores from 2018-2019 for students who are taking the FSA Algebra 1 or Geometry end of course exam in 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Antonius Barnes (barneag@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Push in and pull out support for struggling students especially those in the lowest quartile, by ESE and ELL staff, access to the learning lab for additional support, and development of mathematics tutoring opportunities for all students, while specifically inviting target group students to tutoring opportunities will be our primary strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	While there is limited evidence on the best classroom structure for teaching and supporting ELL students, the Institute of Education Sciences, the Education Department's research agency, has identified rigorous evidence that providing small-group interventions for students struggling with specific problems in their classes that are related to their level of language development is among the most effective practices for teaching academic content to ELL students. https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/05/11/teaching-english-language-learners-what-does-the-research.html Not all Hispanic students are ELL students. All students benefit from tutoring opportunities. The US Department of Education has identified tutoring as a strong evidence based support for Hispanic students. https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PES/Hispanic/Help_Hispanic_Students.pdf These strategies will work to support any student, and specifically those in this particular target group and can be modified for differentiation for all students.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify students in the lowest 25% of math scores overall 2. Identify what score is needed to show a gain for these students 3. Common planning for teachers working with this group of students as much as possible 4. New and varying tutoring support 5. Each teacher, regardless of subject, knows who among their students falls within this target group 6. All teachers, regardless of subject, will support math instruction 7. Identify classes of need for push in and pull out support and ensure a schedule is created to enact this support. 8. Looking towards the future of tested students, we will also dual block for math all 1 and 2 scoring incoming 9th grade students who have not completed Algebra, so that in the following year, when they are tested, they will be able to maintain a strong level of success for our school in 2020-2021. 9. Graduation counselor contacts, personalized notices to students, and expansion of

social media advertisement of tutoring opportunities.

10. Specialized and additional target group will be our hispanic students, as they have the greatest need for support according to the school report card.

11. Administrative walk-throughs to support teacher implementation of the plan, as monitored by Google survey completed at each walk-through observation. The strategies and processes supported in this include items like posting learning objectives and standards daily, having progress monitoring opportunities for students to get feedback, and common lesson planning and pacing.

12. Professional Learning Communities of teachers meet once a week to develop, plan, implement, and monitor common assessments.

Person Responsible   Britt Smith (smithjb@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

We will work to receive training and support to better implement Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Behavior strategies. Our biggest goal is improved documentation of current strategies and individualized student plans already in place.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

1. The School Advisory Committee meets quarterly.to inform parents of important issues and events.

2. Grades, attendance, and behavior are available to parents through Parent Portal.

3. Teachers communicate lessons, objectives, and assessments through the use of Remind, Edmodo, and Schoology.

4. Athletic events, SAC meetings, student performances, and club activities are posted on the school web page.

5. IRIS alerts are sent by phone as needed to inform parents, faculty, and staff of important events.

6. Prior to the beginning of the school year, incoming 9th graders and their parents are invited to Fish Camp for the purpose of touring the school, meeting teachers, and receiving important information regarding school policies and procedures.

7. School culinary department provides a meal at Open House.

8. Implementation of PBS (Positive Behavior System) school-wide.

9. Incorporation of social media to inform all stakeholders of current and upcoming school events/activities.

10. Scrolling informational sign is displayed at the front of the campus.

11. Band, Sports, Theatre and other school-related organizations reach out through regular and annual parent meetings.

12. CANVAS, Remind, and Edmodo are used as tools for communication between teachers, students, and parents.

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.

The school ensures that the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by providing counseling on a needs basis. Referrals are submitted to the Counselor who meets with students and develops an individualized plan to meet their social-emotional needs. Additionally, the school offers peer mediation that helps minimize social-emotional disturbances. Arnold High School is assisted by military liasons to provide group counseling to those students who quality and show a need or desire. Bay Education Foundation is used as a valuable resource in providing peer counselors. Incoming 9th grade students are offered services through the Big Brother/Big Sister Collegiate Studies program. Arnold High School encourages teacher mentoring with students on an as needed basis and faculty members serve as leaders in extracurricular programs to encourage and support the needs of its students.
Resource Services are provided by numerous site-based and district personnel to include but not limited to school psychologists, social workers, guidance counselors, etc.
Staff Specialist: Susan Carpenter and Elaine Brock- IEPs and 504s are monitored and updated by the Staffing Specialists. ESE students are supported within general education classroom by guidelines for instructional strategies as well as Instructors working collaboratively to ensure the needs of the students' are being met.

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

School counselors visit the middle schools to explain and promote high school curriculum to incoming Freshmen. Collegiate Studies Director is actively involved in recruitment of middle school students for the collegiate studies program. Furthermore, a collegiate studies parent night is conducted to provide information concerning the collegiate studies curriculum offered through the school. Middle school students are also brought to Arnold High school to tour the campus and to see programs offered at our school such as culinary, ROTC, band, athletics, etc.
During the summer, the Collegiate Studies Director and school counselors are available to discuss classes and curriculum for the upcoming school year.
A freshman Fish Camp is offered before the start of school to provide students the opportunity to receive their schedules for the year and to walk through classrooms before the first day of school.
For outgoing cohorts, the guidance team hosts a Career Week and invites local businesses to meet with students who are looking for jobs. Additionally, the guidance team hosts a College Night in the spring allowing recruiters from local colleges including Troy University, Gulf Coast State College, Haney Technical College, and Florida State University Panama City Campus to meet with outgoing students in the spring to give them final information on applying for admission and financial aid.
All outgoing cohorts meet directly with guidance staff to discuss college and career planning.

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 school leadership team, led by Antonius Barnes, met weekly from August 2017 through September 2017 to disaggregate data and to discuss areas of need within the school. The team used the 8-Step

Planning and Problem-Solving Model to develop Smart goals and strategies for school improvement. Principal, Keith Bland, provided information regarding district-allocated school funds and any other resources available which would be available to support the goals developed by the SIP team.

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

Arnold High School promotes student involvement and input when developing each student's schedule.
*Allows students to input in the spring semester for the next year's schedule, thus allowing students to select courses that interest them.
*Meets individually with students and parents to discuss curriculum maps for specific college and career options.
*Conducts senior meetings to provide students with college and career information including college entrance requirements, applying for financial aid and Bright Futures scholarships, and resume building.
*Provides information to Collegiate Studies students following PSAT testing to use the College Board website, Big Futures, to explore career options and future college choices.
*Invites representatives from various colleges, both in state and out of state, to discuss entrance requirements, credit transfers, and college life. This allows students to have knowledge and insight when selecting a college.
*Partnership grant with Florida State University Panama City to allow their college students to visit our campus and our students an opportunity to visit the college campus in order for students to gain awareness of programs offered.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25% Students	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest 25%	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00