

Bay District Schools

J.R. Arnold High School



2020-21 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 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

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: 2/1/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 36% |
| 2019-20 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%) |
| 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, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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 | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

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) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| High School 9-12 | No | 50% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 27% |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| Grade | B | B | A | B |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 | |
| Hurst, Jan | Teacher, K-12 | |
| | SAC Member | |
| Dunlap, Anji | Administrative Support | |
| Bauer, Chris | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Green, Dia | Teacher, ESE | |
| Moore, Jonathon | Assistant Principal | |
| Gussaroff, John | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Green, Sean | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Ziem, Ryan | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 2/1/2019, Britt Smith

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

77

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 36% |
| 2019-20 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%) |
| 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, [click here](#).

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 | 0 | 436 | 384 | 353 | 319 | 1492 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 37 | 33 | 25 | 171 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 47 | 49 | 38 | 219 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 46 | 52 | 31 | 147 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 28 | 50 | 31 | 128 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 50 | 50 | 35 | 218 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 32 | 24 | 15 | 130 |

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 | 0 | 94 | 62 | 71 | 42 | 269 |

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 | 0 | 30 | 22 | 14 | 0 | 66 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 30 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/6/2020

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 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 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 | 0 | 86 | 60 | 51 | 55 | 252 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 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 | 0 | 27 | 47 | 42 | 57 | 173 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 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 |

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 |
| 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 |

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% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| 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 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

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 | 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% |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 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% | 0 |

| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 44 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |

| 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% | 0 |

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?

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. Other specifically relating to ELA Lowest 25% Students

Area of Focus Description and 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.

Measurable Outcome: 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 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Britt Smith (smithjb@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.

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>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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 Steps to Implement

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. Other specifically relating to Math Lowest 25% Students

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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 2020-2021.

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 Steps to Implement

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

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

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

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

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.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

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