

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	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	30	22	14	0	66	
Students retained two or more times	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	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

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:	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>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</p> <p>These strategies would work for any student and can be differentiated to support all lowest quartile students.</p>

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