Mowat Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mowat Middle School

1903 W HIGHWAY 390, Lynn Haven, FL 32444

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ed Sheffield, Jr

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	79%
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 (61%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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

Mowat Middle School

1903 W HIGHWAY 390, Lynn Haven, FL 32444

[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)
Middle School 6-8	No	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

Mowat Middle School's mission is to create an engaging learning environment that inspires all students to reach their full academic potential and become socially responsible citizens and life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to educate the students of today for the demands of tomorrow.

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
Sheffield, Ed	Principal	The SLT meets monthly to review the school improvement goals, address strategies relating to current data, and strategize solutions for potential problems for upcoming events.
Walker, Cyndee	Assistant Principal	
Hicks, David	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Mandeville	Teacher, K-12	
Guthrie, Mike	Teacher, K-12	
Miller, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	
Buchanan, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	
Gillmore, Vickie	Dean	
Skipper, Jeff	Teacher, K-12	
Beach, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Spivey, Samantha	Dean	
Ritchie, Rachelle	Teacher, K-12	
Birdwell, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2009, Ed Sheffield, Jr

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.*

7

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	79%
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 (61%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	279	228	259	0	0	0	0	766
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	25	29	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	53	45	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	36	35	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	51	47	0	0	0	0	163

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	44	45	42	0	0	0	0	131

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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/1/2020

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	243	275	315	0	0	0	0	833
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	50	70	0	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	42	63	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	2	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	68	74	0	0	0	0	208

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	32	40	55	0	0	0	0	127

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	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	9

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	243	275	315	0	0	0	0	833
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	50	70	0	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	42	63	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	2	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	68	74	0	0	0	0	208

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	32	40	55	0	0	0	0	127

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	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	9

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	59%	56%	54%	53%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	59%	54%	53%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	55%	47%	48%	49%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	60%	58%	61%	59%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	55%	57%	64%	60%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	55%	51%	65%	59%	50%
Science Achievement	49%	50%	51%	51%	48%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	85%	72%	72%	77%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	62%	56%	6%	54%	8%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	54%	2%	52%	4%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	51%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	59%	59%	0%	56%	3%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	54%	53%	1%	55%	-1%
	2018	50%	52%	-2%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	59%	-1%	54%	4%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	54%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	48%	48%	0%	46%	2%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	45%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	49%	51%	-2%	48%	1%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	50%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	74%	9%	71%	12%
2018	77%	76%	1%	71%	6%
Compare		6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	64%	17%	61%	20%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	91%	64%	27%	62%	29%
Compare		-10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	62%	17%	57%	22%
2018	95%	62%	33%	56%	39%
Compare		-16%			

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	28	58	58	28	47	44	19	64			
ELL	23	50	45	23	47	43					
ASN	88	69		63	25						
BLK	29	46	51	31	47	51	22	67	44		
HSP	61	65	56	67	53	55	47	92	73		
MUL	44	66	72	52	47	64	37	81	80		
WHT	67	65	68	69	55	57	58	88	67		
FRL	52	59	60	54	51	54	43	80	62		
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	19	35	27	27	47	40	26	36	17		
ASN	57	55		80	63						
BLK	24	34	31	35	48	45	27	56	46		
HSP	59	65	71	61	68	50	41	73	60		
MUL	48	40	31	51	55	64		69			
WHT	60	58	53	68	67	71	52	85	68		
FRL	41	44	38	49	60	58	33	71	46		
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	11	41	45	20	41	41	20	48	38		
ASN	77	72		85	76		70	80	90		
BLK	28	41	40	37	57	55	27	63	33		
HSP	50	64	75	64	79	80	38	77	50		
MUL	43	46	50	51	58	50	60	85	38		
WHT	61	55	51	68	65	70	56	80	71		
FRL	41	48	46	49	61	61	36	67	45		

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	61
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	552
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	61
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	63
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	60
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	66
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	57
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.

Science achievement was our lowest area. This continues to be our trend. However, for two years in a row, our students have not had a full school year. Our data is not really valid. In science, students are tested on material from sixth and seventh grade and the lapse in time from when the content was learned until it is tested on negatively affects students' level of retention.

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

Math learning gains is the data component that went down the most. This data was for right after Hurricane Michael, which caused us to be out of school for over a month. Teachers had to review

concepts already taught, as well as cover new material in a much shorter time. Teachers had to assist with social/emotional well-being, as well as teach math. A large number of students were not living in environments conducive to academic study. Last year, we did not return to in-person school after our spring break. This lost us basically nine weeks of direct instruction. Math concepts often rely upon the repetition avail in classes and homework. We had the storm in the 2018-2019 school year and COVID in the 2019-2020 school year, both caused major disruption to learning. This disruption is keenly felt in math.

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.

Social Studies (Civics) had the greatest gap between the school and the state, with the school average being higher. We believe this happened as a result of several factors. One is that we now teach U.S. History in 6th grade. This allows all 6th graders to get pertinent background knowledge necessary to become successful in Civics. Also, our district has a strong Civics program. We have a two veteran Civics teachers who have been very successful utilizing that curriculum.

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

The data shows ELA over all, and especially the lowest quartile had the most improvement in this data. However, we don't believe the reasons are valid for us any longer. During the school year this data represents, our teachers created curriculum they were excited to teach and students were eager to learn.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

We believe that the number of students with attendance below 90% and the number of students who scored a level 1 on a state assessment are our two ares of most concern.

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

1. Behavior (tiers of support)
2. Achievement of ELL students (ESSA)
3. Achievement of ESE students (Data, large amount of time out of school)
4. Math Learning gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Negative student behavior affects not only an individual student's learning, but the learning of others in the classroom. Negative student behavior also affects teacher morale and their ability to effectively reach all students. We believe that a school-wide plan allows common language among all stakeholders. It allows all teachers, students, and parents to know our expectations. We hope to have our expectations extend beyond the classroom to extracurricular activities, clubs, and sports.
Measurable Outcome:	Mowat will have a 5% decrease in the overall number of students who have 2 or more discipline referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vickie Gillmore (gillmvd@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Mowat has a PBIS plan called G.O.L.D.E.N (Good manners, Ownership, Leadership, Diligence, Encouragement, Nobility/Niceness). This is our Tier 1 behavior strategy for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our rationale for selecting this strategy is that PBIS has many years of research-based evidence to support that it is successful. The Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports initiative is a Federal initiative.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teach G.O.L.D.E.N concepts to all students uniformly during the first two weeks.

Person Responsible	Cyndee Walker (walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us)

2. Ensure all students who come to Mowat after the first two weeks of school receive G.O.L.D.E.N. instruction during their critical thinking class.

Person Responsible	Cyndee Walker (walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us)

3. Have teachers re-teach G.O.L.D.E. N. concepts on an as needed basis.

Person Responsible	Cyndee Walker (walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us)

4. Use G.O.L.D.E.N. tickets as reinforcement for students who exhibit the G.O.L.D.E.N. traits. These tickets are redeemable in the school store.

Person Responsible	Cyndee Walker (walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us)

5. Embed G.O.L.D.E.N. traits in regular instruction.

Person Responsible	Ed Sheffield (sheffet1@bay.k12.fl.us)

6. Use BDS 360 computer program to reinforce G.OL.D.E.N. concepts for kids in ISS or otherwise have behavior struggles.

Person Responsible	Vickie Gillmore (gillmvd@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ELL students were our one subgroup that did not achieve 41% on the Federal Index for ESSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The ELL students will achieve 41% on the Federal Index for ESSA raised from our current 39%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cyndee Walker (walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will use ELS Reading Smart and Imagine Learning programs programs in their ELA class and during critical thinking.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	For the ELL students to do well on standardized tests, they must learn English. These programs are provided by our district to facilitate English language acquisition.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Enroll all ELL students in ESL Reading Smart and Imagine Learning.

Person Responsible   Cyndee Walker (walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us)

2. Enroll ELL students in a critical thinking class with trained teacher.

Person Responsible   Cyndee Walker (walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us)

3. Ensure students work in programs with fidelity. Teacher and program monitor usage.

Person Responsible   Cyndee Walker (walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us)

4. Track student progress through the programs and through data collected in classroom walk-throughs.

Person Responsible   Cyndee Walker (walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our students with disabilities subgroup is one that has consistently under-performed. Except for a small number of students on access points, these students are 100% mainstreamed. We have a Learning Lab where our ESE students may go for additional assistance. The Learning Lab is supported by ESE teachers who can readily access IEP's and provide individualized instruction based on the student's accommodations. Our school has a one-to-one Chromebook initiative. Based on both observation and anecdotal evidence, we believe that our ESE students are under-utilizing this powerful tool, often because no one has shown them how it could additionally support their learning beyond the use specifically required in the classroom.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the overall ELA achievement for the SWD subgroup to 30.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rachelle Ritchie (ritchrm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Self-Regulated Strategy Development specifically for the use of Chromebook tools to assist SWD to use tools such as highlighting, text-to-speech and speech-to text, visual aids (contrast and content presentation options, screen reader, magnifier) and mono audio for students with limited hearing, in conjunction with their specific IEP accommodations to make text and writing more accessible.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As providing Accessible Instructional Materials (AIM) is a part of FAPE under IDEA, we believe that we can do a better job of helping our SWD better utilize an important instructional tool they already have in their possession. Our data indicates that this is a population that has room for improvement and our observations further indicate that there are many Chromebook features not being globally utilized.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Learning lab teachers and case managers will work with the ESE students to develop educational goals and self regulation skills. The teacher/manager will then determine what Chromebook functions will best help the student achieve the goal(s) and self-monitor when best to utilize particular functions.

Person Responsible	Rachelle Ritchie (ritchrm@bay.k12.fl.us)

2. The teacher/manager will develop a strategy for use of the tool/tools, will discuss the strategy with the student, will model the strategy, will help the student perform the strategy, and will watch while the student independently performs the strategy or use of the tool.

Person Responsible	Rachelle Ritchie (ritchrm@bay.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When we looked at our data, we realized that we had a decline in the lowest quartile in math from the last year that we tested (2018-2019) to the previous year. While we feel it might be due to a lack of time for math instruction following Hurricane Michael, we know that those students will continue to struggle with foundational skills, especially with last year's distance learning due to the COVID-19 virus.
Measurable Outcome:	Lowest quartile learning gains will increase to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Hicks (hicksds@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students in the lowest quartile have an intensive math class that focuses on closing learning gaps using the Dreambox program. Students second part of the math block focuses on current math standards (grade level). Math students who are struggling might also be enrolled in MTSS for math or math remediation during the critical thinking period of the school day, which also increases time spent working on foundational skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Dreambox is an evidence based program provided to us by the school district. The program is designed to differentiate instruction based upon each students' current level and need. It is self-paced, so students do not have to wait for others to catch up. It also provides the instructor with additional information about the deficiencies of the student in order to provide additional supports.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify lowest quartile students and place in block classes.
2. Provide teachers with the training and support necessary to appropriately utilize the Dreambox program.
3. Provide teachers time to work in PLCs to discuss data, including common assessments, regarding student growth on grade level math standards. Monitor PLCs and instruction through classroom walk-throughs to determine if additional supports are needed and what supports.
4. Provide time for MTSS meetings where students are discussed and referred to the MTSS instructional specialist for math.
5. Place students appropriately into math remediation classes as the need arises based on data.

Person Responsible David Hicks (hicksds@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.

n/a

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.

This year, because gatherings are discouraged, we will focus on e-communication. Our administrative secretary sends out information to parents and other stakeholders via Peach Jar. A member of our School Leadership Team maintains our school Face Book page. We are working with our district to ensure that our stakeholders have provided us with current email addresses and phone numbers. Our administrative staff also uses a phone messaging service called LINK. We are also encouraging parents to join us in meetings via Google Meet and to download the CANVAS App to follow their student's progress if they chose our virtual school option, BayLink.

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00