Bay High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bay High School

1200 HARRISON AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Blythe Carpenter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2010

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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 (57%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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

Bay High School

1200 HARRISON AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[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	Yes	77%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission is to provide opportunities and curriculum that are relevant and rigorous so that students demonstrate academic excellence, career readiness, and social sensitivity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a strong academic and collegial atmosphere which allows every student to become a transformational leader.

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
May, Billy	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making and ensures that the school-based team is implementing necessary programs and district initiatives. He also ensures that necessary professional development is available for all stakeholders and oversees the Administration and Guidance Depts. Respon: Admin/Teacher duty assignments, Campus supervision schedule, Dept. Head meetings, S.R.O duty assignment,
Palfrey, Kris	Assistant Principal	Oversees the Title 1 Budget, Science and S.S Dept. Oversees Curriculum guides;Construction (new & renovations), Safety,Dual Enrollment, Newsletter, Faculty & Student Handbook, Technology, Teacher Trainin/Staff Dev, Textbooks
Wiggins, Pam	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Wiggins provides information about core instruction, participates in making sure that Tier 1 instruction is being implemented and student data is collected and analyzed. If needed, she collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. She also serves as leads for PLCs. She currently teaches Pre-AICE and AICE physics, Physical Sci Hon, and Environmental Science
Todd, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Provides information about core instruction, participates in making sure that Tier 1 instruction is being implemented and student data is collected and analyzed. She also leads PLC's, Homecoming activities, and SGA (Elections, Procedures, etc). She currently teaches AICE Eng. Lit 1, AICE Thinking Skills, and AICE English General paper.
Fowler, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	Provides information about core instruction, participates in making sure that Tier 1 instruction is being implemented. She also leads PLCs. She currently teaches: Holocaust, AICE U.S. History, and US History II.
Jones, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Oversees and monitors the SIP process and team to ensure that the goals developed by Bay High stakeholders support the mission and vision. Oversees: CTE Dept and Special Area Dept,Volunteer Program, Covid Administrator, Attendance, Facilities, Custodial Support
Craft, Barbara	Assistant Principal	Serves as the Administrator over the Guidance Dept. and ensures that our underserved and first-generation students have access to vital tools to reach all possible post-high school options.Oversees: Career Education, Honors Ceremony Recognition (getting sponsors), Master schedule, Service- Learning Coordinator, testing coordination
Bailie, Greg	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Currently teaches Culinary 1-4, and weight training 2
Grady, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Assistant Administrator, Athletic Director, Athletic Security, Athletic Physical/ Parent Permission, Booster clubs, Volunteer Pro (Athletics)

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Adam	Other	Teaches: Read/Write music, Band, Instru Techn, Orch 6 Hon, Understanding Music, Jazz

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/12/2010, Blythe Carpenter

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.*

2

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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 (57%) 2017-18: B (56%)

	2016-17: C (49%)
	2015-16: C (50%)
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	262	283	261	211	1017
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	39	22	20	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	79	41	35	227
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	32	31	81
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	13	15	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	83	60	43	263
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	65	51	27	207

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	76	89	66	48	279

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	1	1	0	4	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	13	6	39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

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	301	284	228	249	1062
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	39	41	56	225
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	63	43	36	229
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	40	18	45	112
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	89	62	61	328

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	84	62	45	55	246

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	11	6	3	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	9	9	11	51

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	301	284	228	249	1062
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	39	41	56	225
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	63	43	36	229
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	40	18	45	112
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	89	62	61	328

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	84	62	45	55	246

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	11	6	3	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	9	9	11	51

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	53%	57%	56%	41%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	49%	51%	35%	44%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	35%	42%	27%	35%	41%
Math Achievement	44%	58%	51%	36%	58%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	53%	48%	36%	50%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	50%	45%	29%	48%	39%
Science Achievement	83%	74%	68%	57%	68%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	76%	73%	65%	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	54%	58%	-4%	55%	-1%
	2018	41%	54%	-13%	53%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	48%	53%	-5%	53%	-5%
	2018	46%	52%	-6%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

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	84%	71%	13%	67%	17%
2018	56%	64%	-8%	65%	-9%
Compare		28%			

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	70%	74%	-4%	70%	0%
2018	67%	73%	-6%	68%	-1%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	64%	-39%	61%	-36%
2018	66%	64%	2%	62%	4%
Compare		-41%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	62%	-9%	57%	-4%
2018	45%	62%	-17%	56%	-11%
Compare		8%			

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	36	53	49	36	35	27	64	35		92	24
ELL	14	15	14	5						67	42
ASN	69	44									
BLK	27	34	31	21	38		62	35		84	58
HSP	43	35	28	43	44		92	82		70	47
MUL	57	62		36	50		83	63		94	65
WHT	64	59	44	53	47	43	85	83		86	81
FRL	48	45	35	38	42	36	80	65		79	63

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	29	18	25	53		28	73		67	25
ELL	3	20	25	23	60		21			45	
ASN	69	36								100	90
BLK	26	36	31	28	47	40	34	53		67	57
HSP	32	35	26	51	65		35	54		68	71
MUL	46	53		62	56		58	67		87	75
WHT	57	45	31	64	58	63	69	82		84	78
FRL	37	38	27	41	51	43	44	61		70	65

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	18	32	32	16	25	23	31	48		59	37
ELL	15	27	32	17	21	13	38			80	
ASN				38	27						
BLK	20	22	17	21	33	25	36	42		78	57
HSP	23	26	33	27	31	20	48	45		90	72
MUL	42	29		34	28	40	58	73		92	58
WHT	56	45	38	47	40	41	70	84		85	84
FRL	31	31	26	29	32	26	48	56		77	67

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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	619

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	57
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	53
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	65
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	53
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.

The Subgroup Data Category showed the lowest performance, in regards to our English Language Learner population. This subgroup scored below the 41% threshold. We have a high transitory population as well as a high number of ELL students entering the school. The district is still working positively towards sustaining and improving the NewComer program. Language barrier is also a huge factor as well as resources.

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

The Math lowest 25th Percentile declined from 52% in 2018 to 39% in 2019. Algebra 1A and 1B were split. Previously our higher performing students tested.

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.

Our Science Achievement had the greatest positive gap (Bay 83%, State 68%). This was due to our AICE students testing. Our ELA lowest 25th% (35 to 42) and Math Achievement (44 to 51) both had a negative gap of 7 when compared to state. Again, the math was due to the split as mentioned above in (b) and as regarding ELA lowest 25%- Hurricane Michael caused a lot of disruption and displacement, as well as increased our transitory issues.

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

Science Achievement due to the way the schedule was implemented; AICE students were assigned in this tested subject.

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

1) Level 1 on statewide assessment is a concern.
2) Number of suspensions (OSS & ISS) which results in being out of class

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

1. Continue to increase in the area of ELA to include lowest 25%, with an emphasis on our ELL population
2. Decrease Behavior Referrals

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Reading Proficiency in Lowest 25% with Emphasis on subgroup of ELL : One of the critical areas that we scored poorly in was that of the lowest 25th percentile in ELA. Currently we have 270 LV 1 students and while this is down from last year, we need to decrease this even further. Academic success in reading is imperative if students are to accomplish academic excellence in all content areas, leading to enhanced FSA scores, and laying a very strong foundation leading to college and career readiness. Our goal is to provide necessary professional development in close reading, student feedback, and cultural sensitivity, so that our faculty and staff become equipped with the necessary strategies to foster increased academic achievement. This year we have increased our awareness of our ELL population and their very specific needs, as they are the single subgroup that did not attain the 41% threshold. Thus we are targeting all of our lowest 25% but with a focus on the ELL subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	To improve student reading proficiency levels by 12% in the lowest 25% (ELA) with an emphasis on ELL as measured by the FSA assessment by end of SY 2020-2021
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Jones (joneslm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing feedback and goal setting opportunities to students, focusing on the lowest 25% of our student population with emphasis on our ELL population.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Hattie and Timperley (2007) feedback is one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement, but this impact can be either positive or negative. They developed a model of effective feedback that identifies the particular properties and circumstances that make it work. Feedback on task, process and self regulation level is far more effective than on the Self-level (e.g. praise wich contains no learning information). Descriptive feedback is closely related to providing formative assessment (see above). In an interview Hattie emphasized that the most powerful feedback is that given from the student to the teacher. This feedback allows teachers to see learning through the eyes of their students. It makes learning visible and facilitates the planning of next steps. The feedback that students receive from their teachers is also vital. It enables students to progress towards challenging learning intentions and goals. Hattie's hinge point for feedback is 0.73, and for goals it's 0.56; we know that anything above .4 yields gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Data Mining- Id lowest 25% of whole student body and of our ELL subgroup; also Id our ELL at population that have scored a 3 or better in Math and Science. Provide these students relevant feedback and goal setting

Person Responsible	Barbara Craft (craftba@bay.k12.fl.us)

Continue Close Reading and exposing students to rigorous text

Person Responsible	Barbara Craft (craftba@bay.k12.fl.us)

Provide PD (district resource) to include but not limited to interpreting data and giving effective feedback. Schedule Elevation training for teachers

Person Responsible	Kris Palfrey (palfrkl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Provide student writing opportunities.

Person Responsible	Lisa Jones (joneslm@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Other specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Discipline: Disruptive behavior by one student also encourages other students to do the same, which compromises the teacher's authority and ability to control the group. The learning process for other students is affected when one or more students behave in a disruptive manner. Constant interruptions can interfere with the ability to learn.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease student discipline referrals by 10% as measured by FOCUS by end of SY 2020-2021
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Grady (gradyml@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement Behavioral Intervention Program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The aspects listed in the "Action Steps" section are components of a behavioral program. According to Hattie this has a 0.62 hinge point.

Action Steps to Implement

MTSS/District Coaching/Behavior Team- MTSS leadership team will meet monthly to discuss interventions for students displaying repetitive negative behavior choices. Teachers will discuss T2/T3 students during PLCs. District Coaches and Behavior team will continue to offer support to our students and teachers as needed.

Person Responsible	Barbara Craft (craftba@bay.k12.fl.us)

District Social/Emotional Supports - PD by district personnel to help teachers support our student population's social and emotional needs. District behavior teams are also available to assist teachers with problem behaviors and classroom management.

Person Responsible	Kris Palfrey (palfrkl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Mentoring: Depending on Covid Guidelines

Person Responsible	Lisa Jones (joneslm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Red Pride Implementation - This is Bay High's positive behavior team. They will plan celebrations and ways in which to recognize positive behavioral trends.

Person Responsible	Michael Grady (gradyml@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.

1. Level 1 on statewide assessment is a concern- Teachers will continue plan as a PLC , looking at the data to drive instruction, and sharing knowledge. Teachers will give student feedback to ensure students know where they stand academically and how they can improve their standing. 2) Number of suspensions (OSS & ISS) which results in being out of class- The school will be working delving deeper in the MTSS process with the Triad district team

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.

Bay High School seeks to have parental involvement in all areas of student activities, both curricular and co-curricular. Our target is to make known to parents the benefits of participation and support of our students. This is done through regular updates to the Bay District school website , Everbridge alerts, a quarterly newsletter, Bay High School Facebook page, Bay High School's Twitter account, and Remind101 for seniors. Parents are strongly encouraged to participate in and or attend parent/teacher conferences, Open House, Parent Workshops, and SAC meetings in which they will learn about curriculum used, what levels students are expected to achieve, about the FSA and other assessments and how the results are used. Also, all parents are given the opportunity to complete an online and paper based Title 1 Spring Parent Survey. The results are tallied and shared with the faculty and during a SAC meeting. Based on the surveys and review of parent input forms, changes are made to the PFEP for the next school year. The PFEP is reviewed throughout the year to meet the needs of the parents and school. During SAC meetins results from a comprehensive needs assessment are discussed. Strategies from the current year's SIP are reviewed by all stakeholders. Revisions are made based on parent input. This year we are also focusing on exposing our students, faculty and staff to various cultures through exciting activities.Also we now offer 2 new Social Studies courses-African American History and Holocaust History to build empathy and understanding, we have the StreetLights group-serving our homeless students; AICE students who serve at Chautauqua assisting the early adult mentally challenged students and building tolerance; our SGA class mentors with Building 13 students (Special Needs students) 1x/week building empathy and peer relationships , and we have "Start With Hello"- lessons in SGA class to break down barriers of social isolation and promote inclusion throughout the school.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Discipline	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00