

Bay District Schools

Rosenwald High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Rosenwald High School

924 BAY AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jonathan Mcquagge

Start Date for this Principal: 9/6/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Rosenwald High School

924 BAY AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[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)
Combination School PK, 6-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2012-13	2011-12
Grade		

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.

Rosenwald High School will provide a safe, structured, and supportive environment that inspires students to stay in school and graduate ready for college or careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

EDUCATION. GRADUATION. DESTINATION.

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
Tyson, Chandra	Principal	<p>Chandra Tyson (principal)</p> <p>Provides a common and clearly defined vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS with fidelity, conducts assessments/evaluations of MTSS skills and practices of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention supports and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation and communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.</p>
Head, Debra	Teacher, K-12	<p>Debra Head (Regular Education ELA and College Career Ready Teacher, High School Dept. Chair)</p> <p>Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis and evaluation, instruction/interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring. Also, she serves on the district's ELA committee as our school liaison.</p>
Stanquist, Ray	Assistant Principal	<p>Ray Stanquist (Assistant Principal)</p> <p>Provides leadership to support the vision and mission of the school using data analysis protocols and prescriptive feedback to staff, oversees the PBIS implementation to ensure flawless fidelity, oversees the FSA testing administration, and provides targeted professional development.</p>
Karas, Carly	Teacher, K-12	<p>Carly Karas (Regular Education Science Teacher, Activities Coordinator)</p> <p>Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis, and evaluation, instruction/interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring. As the activities coordinator, she plans student-led activities throughout the year to enhance the culture and climate of the school. Also, she serves on the district's biology committee as our school's liaison.</p>
Washington, Elois	Other	<p>Elois Washington (Graduation Coach/Interventionist)</p> <p>Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis, and evaluation, instruction/interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring. She also finds viable graduation pathway options for students.</p>
Wellman, Jane	Teacher, K-12	<p>Jane Wellman (Regular and ESE classroom ELA and Social Science teacher)</p> <p>Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis and evaluation, instruction/interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring.</p>

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	21	30	34	44	38	29	40	236	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	21	20	31	27	21	31	164	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	22	24	18	14	11	120	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	6	15	21	19	22	92	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	25	37	26	26	30	183	

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	15	23	26	35	29	26	33	187	

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	9	14	10	15	12	9	6	75	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	11	20	20	15	18	113	

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

15

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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	29	20	23	29	101	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16	18	11	70	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	18	15	78	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	28	25	19	101	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	32	27	27	26	112	

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	29	20	23	29	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16	18	11	70
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	18	15	78
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	28	25	19	101
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	32	27	27	26	112

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	0%	73%	61%	0%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	64%	59%	0%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	58%	54%	0%	56%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	70%	62%	0%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	57%	59%	0%	59%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	52%	0%	58%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	65%	56%	0%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	86%	78%	0%	79%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	21 (0)	30 (0)	34 (0)	44 (0)	38 (0)	29 (0)	40 (0)	236 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (0)	21 (0)	20 (0)	31 (29)	27 (20)	21 (23)	31 (29)	164 (101)
One or more suspensions	11 (0)	20 (0)	22 (0)	24 (25)	18 (16)	14 (18)	11 (11)	120 (70)
Course failure in ELA or Math	7 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	15 (24)	21 (21)	19 (18)	22 (15)	92 (78)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	15 (0)	24 (0)	25 (0)	37 (29)	26 (28)	26 (25)	30 (19)	183 (101)

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
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	13%	58%	-45%	55%	-42%
	2018	9%	54%	-45%	53%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	9%	52%	-43%	53%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	22%	71%	-49%	67%	-45%
2018	8%	64%	-56%	65%	-57%
Compare		14%			
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	23%	74%	-51%	70%	-47%
2018	48%	73%	-25%	68%	-20%
Compare		-25%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	61%	-61%
2018	3%	64%	-61%	62%	-59%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	10%	62%	-52%	57%	-47%
2018	15%	62%	-47%	56%	-41%
Compare		-5%			

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										69	
BLK								7		35	17
WHT				7						24	40
FRL	7	17		3	46		19	24		36	26
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

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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	19
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	153
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	70%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	69
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	12
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	24
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	22
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Seventy-eight percent (78%) of all enrolled students scored a level 1 on state ELA and math assessments. Ninety percent (90%) of current 11th grade students scored a level 1 on state ELA and math assessments. Gaps of learning caused by two or more years of retention, low attendance rates,

and course failures in ELA and math is the main contributing factor to poor student proficiency. Due to a change in grade level composition at the school, there is no current trend data to assess.

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

In the 2017-18 school year, 101 students scored a level 1 on state ELA and math assessments as compared to 183 students scoring a level 1 in the 2018-19 school year. This is the greatest decline in the early warning signs measured from year to year. Comparing their performance as 11th grade students in the 2017-18 school year, current 12th grade students had the greatest decline in performance during the 2018-19 school year. Attendance also declined from the 2017-18 school year, which we believe correlates to the increase in level 1 scores.

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.

Currently, there is no school grade data available to complete the gap analysis.

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

The SWD ESSA subgroup showed a 47% increase in achievement and learning gains. Research-based reading strategies were implemented with fidelity in our intensive reading courses. Students identified as ESE were assigned to homerooms led by their case managers to ensure regular consultation. Finally, multiple intensive study sessions were scheduled throughout the year to target these and other students.

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

Attendance below 90% is our major area of concern.

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

1. Improve attendance
2. Improve proficiency on state assessments

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improving Attendance
Rationale	Data shows that non-attendance leads to retention, which results in lower levels of proficiency of ELA, Algebra I, and Geometry state assessments. Currently, 70% of enrolled students had an attendance rate of less than 90% during the previous school year. Therefore, a focus on attendance is what we believe will lead to higher proficiency rates of state assessments.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May of 2020, students will increase their average daily attendance by 5% through the implementation of research-based practices.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elois Washington (washiej@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will use the positive behavioral interventions and supports rewards program (PBIS).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS has been used in many schools to understand the challenging behaviors of students and to help them change those behaviors. This program assists the individual in modifying his or her inappropriate, functional behavior to more acceptable levels of behavioral performance. These behaviors are supported by reinforcement in the school environment.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selected staff will conduct home visits. 2. Attendance improvement plans will be created with the identified students at risk of non-attendance. 3. Check-in/Check-outs will be implemented for students identified as Tier II within the MTSS model. 4. Positive behaviors and expectations will be reinforced through PBIS initiatives. 5. Attendance data and progress monitoring will be analyzed by the Attendance Matters Task Force.
Person Responsible	Ray Stanquist (stanqrj@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Improving Proficiency in ELA and Math
Rationale	<p>In the 2018-19 school year, 183 students scored a level 1 on ELA and math assessments, 92 students failed courses, and 75 retentions occurred. Economically disadvantaged, black, and white student subgroups performed below 41%. However, 69% of ESE subgroup performed above the 41%. A focus on improving proficiency is what we believe will lead to improved state assessment scores and decrease course failures and retentions. Three standards have been selected for school-wide focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -RI.1.1 - Cite textual to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text. -RI.2.4 - Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative, connotative, and technical meanings. -W.4.10 - Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Upon release of school grades, student learning gains will have increased by 10% through the implementation of research-based practices.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chandra Tyson (tysoncl@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will use the Edgenuity blended learning program to improve student academic trajectories.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Blended learning programs, like Edgenuity, provide a formal education program in which students receive both online and face-to-face instruction. In case studies, students who participated in Edgenuity courses outperformed their peers, showed statistically significant improvements on state assessments, and improved graduation rates.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation with fidelity of a blended learning model via the Edgenuity online platform 2. Improving teacher practices through action research and data analysis within the PLCs 3. Offering extended learning opportunities to target under-performing subgroups (i.e., boot camps) 4. Monitoring student proficiency using the ELA Text-Based Writing Rubric in Rosenwald Writes assessments 5. Refer students with gaps in learning or not responding to instruction to MTSS Leadership team
Person Responsible	Chandra Tyson (tysoncl@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).

To improve the culture and climate of the school, we will implement safety initiatives, social/emotional learning skills, and restorative justice practices.

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.

See PIP

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.

Rosenwald High School ensures social-emotional needs of all students are met by providing opportunities for student access to teachers as advisors(in which teachers teach SEL skills in our Rosenwald Advisory Program), guidance counselors, a school psychologist, a behavior interventionist, a graduation coach, a licensed social worker, a behavioral health therapist, and staff trained in effective social-emotional practices. Mentors are also assigned to classes or to individual students to assist in ensuring all students have access to quality adult/student ratios. In addition, guest speakers are identified to facilitate assemblies or focus groups such as participation in Tommie Mabry's Leadership Institute. This year we will continue to implement the Co-Vitality and BDS 360 Programs to develop students' and enhance teachers' social-emotional learning skills. Also, we will implement a new social and emotional learning curriculum school-wide called Strong Kids. Targeted students will also participate in restorative practice circles to build appropriate relationships, create safe spaces, build connections, and reduce conflict within the school community.

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

Rosenwald provides strategies at the beginning of the year such as orientation for new students and incoming sixth-ninth graders, Open House, and initial guidance counselor/student/parent interviews. During the year, the school's strategies include: RAP (Rosenwald Advisory Program)-a daily advisory period, military recruitment throughout the year, support from community partners such Gulf Coast Children's Advocacy Program, offering of teen parenting courses to support pregnant teens or teenage mothers, horticulture training, ACT/SAT tutorials, career day explorations, job fairs, and college application/ essay workshops. The end of the year strategies includes college visits, financial literacy programs, transitional planning for eighth-grade students, and post-secondary educational experiences.

Title I, Part C Migrant funds are used for the following purposes:

Advocacy and outreach activities

Support for schools serving migrant students

Family literacy programs, such as programs that use models developed under Even Start
The integration of information technology into educational programs
Programs to facilitate the transition of secondary school students to post-secondary education or employment

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.

1. This MTSS leadership team meets monthly to review Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plan, monitor student progress, and problem-solve for students not responding to interventions.
2. The Graduation Assistance team reviews graduation rates and academic trends to identify graduation options monthly.
3. Students non-proficient of the FSA reading test are placed in an intensive reading course.
4. New course credits and credit recovery courses are assigned based upon progression meeting graduation requirements using Edgenuity.
5. The interventionist facilitates SEL practices school-wide. The ESE resource teacher oversees all ESE case management. The LSW offers support to families/ students, conducts home visits. The Behavioral Health Therapist provides on-site counseling.
6. Title I Federal Initiatives:

Title I, Part A funds are coordinated with federal, state, and local funds and services to provide high-quality supplemental instruction and support services for educationally disadvantaged students at schools with 86% or more students qualifying for the Free/Reduced Lunch Program. The purpose of Title I funding is to implement programs and services that ensure that all children have a fair, equal and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state academic assessments. Title I, Part A funds and various other funds are coordinated and integrated to provide services for private schools, local neglected and delinquent institutions, and Homeless Programs.

Title I, Part C Migrant allows the student or their family that has moved at any time in the last three years to seek work in agriculture, packing, fishing, dairy, livestock, or forestry and is between the age of two and twenty-two years old. Bay District Schools is part of a consortium through PAEC that provides assistance for migrant students and their families. Migrant programs provide funds to assist migrant children and their families.

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

Each student (and the student's parents) meets with a guidance counselor to tailor a course of study that specifically targets the student's individual needs resulting in a career and graduation pathway. Each student's academic, assessment, and discipline history along with their career interest are reviewed in order to assist students with their choices.

Career & Technical Education teacher(s) and content area teachers will work together as a team to

determine a range of careers in specific industries as well as identify course standards that could be applied to the industry. The team of teachers will work with business and industry partners to build their capacity and understanding of the industry's daily work.

Students will participate in a College & Career and Job Fairs to explore a variety of job opportunities.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improving Attendance	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improving Proficiency in ELA and Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00