

Bay District Schools

Mowat Middle School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	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	39%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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	Position 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. Additionally each teacher is also a department chair and member of a PLC and work to guide their PLCs as they weekly work on PLC goals, lesson plans, supporting the SIP and determining remediation and enrichment tasks for students.
Walker, Cyndee	Assistant Principal	
Beach, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Birdwell, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Buchanan, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	
Petro, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Hicks, David	Teacher, K-12	
Skipper, Jeff	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Mandeville	Teacher, K-12	
Guilford, Stu	Teacher, K-12	
Miller, Nicole	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

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

831

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	272	312	247	0	0	0	0	831
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	61	59	0	0	0	0	188
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	9	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	3	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	18	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	59	56	0	0	0	0	180
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	93	50	0	0	0	0	219
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	41	38	0	0	0	0	112

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	4	24	16	0	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	6	0	0	0	0	22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				59%	56%	54%	52%	54%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	59%	54%	52%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	55%	47%	44%	47%	47%
Math Achievement				61%	60%	58%	60%	61%	58%
Math Learning Gains				52%	55%	57%	63%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	55%	51%	59%	58%	51%
Science Achievement				49%	50%	51%	47%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				85%	72%	72%	77%	76%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	62%	56%	6%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2021					
	2019	59%	59%	0%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	54%	53%	1%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	58%	59%	-1%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2021					
	2019	48%	48%	0%	46%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	48%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	83%	74%	9%	71%	12%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	81%	64%	17%	61%	20%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	62%	17%	57%	22%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Bay District schools has moved to iReady for the purpose of Progress Monitoring for the 21-22 school year. This will be given three times per year and the data will be used to drive instruction, interventions and acceleration for all students. Additionally, a new system of progress monitoring for Social Studies and Science using our District Common Assessments through Mastery Connect will track student progress of content standards.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	21	39	36	21	29	28	21	63			
ELL	24	36		19	21						
ASN	81	81		81	50						
BLK	24	37	33	17	31	33	26	51			
HSP	53	44	47	45	37	27	47	81	50		
MUL	57	47	50	39	42	38	36	67			
WHT	57	51	47	58	43	49	58	85	74		
FRL	42	43	40	38	39	41	41	68	66		
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					

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	28

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

We do not have the subgroups disaggregated (comes from the state). However, using our own FSA data we noticed that all areas appeared to have dropped, with the exception of acceleration and science. Science increased over the previous testing year, but was below the district level.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

We need work in all areas (ELA, math, science), but our students with disabilities and our English language learners stand out as our greatest need. These students also tend to be in our lowest quartile of each subject area.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Bay county has had three years of interrupted learning (Hurricane Michael and two pandemic years). Some students are still homeless or living in temporary housing. Attendance is often sporadic, especially with quarantines. A significant number of our students chose "distance learning" last year, then did not participate. Many came back after winter break with even larger deficits. New actions would be PLCs working together to specifically fill in the noticeable gaps by determining which skills are a prerequisite for a task and teaching that skill at that time. PLCs will work together to ensure that work students need is uploaded in CANVAS, the platform that the district has provided for distance learning, in hopes that students will continue to work while quarantined or otherwise not in school.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science and middle school acceleration showed the most improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We have had a fairly consistent science department. They have been diligently working across grade levels to prepare students for the 8th grade test. We have also increased our number of students who take and are successful in high school courses and CTE courses.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Teachers within the PLCs will need to work together, using iReady data, district common assessments, and classroom assessments to determine missing critical skills and concepts. They will need to provide scaffolds to bridge the gaps while precisely teaching those specific skills. Individual

teachers and PLCs will work to provide "just in time" supports/strategies to assist students in accessing grade-level content (as suggested by TNTP).

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will need training in interpreting the iReady diagnostic information and the use of iReady for mathematics and reading (intensive/remedial) instruction. ELA and Social Studies teachers will need additional training in the electronic portion of their curriculum, StudySync. Additionally, teachers will need instruction in strategies that will accelerate learning for subgroups, especially SWD, Black/African American and ELL.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

In addition to the above, ELA and Math teachers will need training in the implementation of Florida BEST standards. PLCs will continue to work to streamline "just in time" supports to students by an understanding of what skills are needed to complete specific tasks and assignments.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Our school mission is to prepare students for the future. Our PLCs are how we work together using data to ensure all students have the same access to the rigorous curriculum they need. Together we work smarter, not harder.

Measurable Outcome: PLCs meet, with shared agenda and data, on assigned days 100% of the time.

Monitoring: PLCs will meet, at a minimum, once a week.
 An administrator will actively serve on each PLC that is organized.
 All agendas will be distributed, a minimum of 24 hours in advance of a scheduled PLC meeting.
 All meeting minutes will be housed in a Google folder for each PLC created by the administrator.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ed Sheffield (sheffet1@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional learning communities have been at the forefront of transforming schools to improve student achievement. Effective PLCs are founded on the shared vision and values of improving learning outcomes for all students. When staff have ongoing, consistent meeting times for PLCs such that they are able to respond to students' needs in a timely manner, those responses are shown to have a greater impact in ensuring all students have equitable opportunities to learn and grow academically.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our students have had three years of learning loss. We need to work together, using data, to fill in gaps while teaching grade-level expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

Have a protected meeting day/time.

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

An administrator will be assigned to each team to actively participate and monitor the work of the PLC.

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

Agendas/minutes are filled out and saved in a Google folder weekly by each PLC.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After two years of COVID, our PLCs have lost continuity, along with our students. Our district has had a "reset" for PLC protocols and guidelines. We believe that our PLCs need to refocus, especially on accelerating student learning due to hurricane and COVID loss. This has resulted in lower scores for most subject areas, especially for our lowest quartile and some subgroups as identified through FSA data, grades, and summer school need.
Measurable Outcome:	Using iReady data, PLCs will identify students performing 2 or more grade levels below their current grade level. Teachers will group students based on skills needed during critical thinking.
Monitoring:	We will look at grades on common assessments, class assignments, and benchmark assessments looking for 70% (C) or better.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ed Sheffield (sheffet1@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement TNTP's 7 Instructional Strategies for Accelerating Student Learning. These strategies are: 1. Scaffolding intentionally, 2. Building Knowledge and Vocabulary, 3. Prioritizing Standards, 4. Modifying Guided Reading, 5. Diagnosing Essential Missed Learning, 6. Utilizing Interdependent Collaborative Student Teams, and 7. Incorporating Text Sets. These will be shared with all teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This is research-based and our district has been working with TNTP. We chose these strategies as we recognize that our students have significant learning gaps. We also recognize that we cannot fill all the gaps prior to grade level instruction. The implementation of these strategies allows students to move forward while their learning gaps are filled in when they need the skills/knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

PLCs will meet and will disaggregate the data to determine the lowest quartile for each subject area.

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

When the students are identified and targeted, the PLC members will access and implement a plan specialized for each group.

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

PLCs will meet and discuss how to implement the 7 strategies. PLC meeting notes will contain how each PLC will implement the strategies based on curriculum and subject area. This discussion will include prioritizing the standards taught per subject.

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

Students who continue to struggle will be placed into critical thinking classes based on needed core instruction as evidenced by the data. They will be monitored and re-evaluated to determine further needed interventions or placement into another critical thinking class for enrichment.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Looking at both our SafeSchoolsforAlex data and our discipline reports for last year, we believe that we need to continue to work on our Tier 1 behavior via the emphasis on our schoolwide positive behavior expectations. All of our categories in the SafeSchoolsforAlex data showed "very low" for each category with the exception of incidence of discipline referrals, which was very high.

Measurable Outcome: Following our school-wide MTSS framework, we will decrease our number of students per hundred who are suspended (ISS/OSS) by 7 students per 100 or down from 32.1 students per 100 to 25 students per 100. This is a significant decrease, but still puts us above the state average of 18.3 per 100 (2019 data).

Monitoring: We have a tier 1 behavior team who meets once a month and a tier II/III behavior leadership team which also meets once a month. The tier I team looks at overall school discipline referrals and works toward decreasing undesirable behavior by focusing on the positive behavioral expectations denoted in our school plan. Our tier II/III team works with individual high-risk students who need support beyond tier I.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cyndee Walker (walkeca@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We are following PBIS guidelines for positive behavior supports. We have school-wide expectations, routines, and procedures. We explicitly teach our school-wide expectations the first week of school and then throughout the year for students who enroll after the first week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Eleven years ago, Mowat became affiliated with PBIS. We feel that the positive behavior guidelines and supports gives clear expectations to students and gives a clear, consistent path for teachers and administrators regarding discipline and expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

Our school wide positive behavior expectations will be posted and visible in classrooms, the front office, cafeteria, hallways, restrooms, and media center.

Person Responsible Samantha Spivey (spives@bay.k12.fl.us)

All teachers will teach six lessons at the beginning of school correlating to our G.O.L.D.E.N. expectations in their critical thinking class.

Person Responsible Courtney Buchanan (buchac@bay.k12.fl.us)

To ensure that all students know our expectations, our self-contained class will teach the G.O.L.D.E.N. lessons to all new students throughout the year as they enroll.

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

All teachers will follow these school-wide routines and procedures:
 escort students to and from lunch
 greet students while standing outside classroom doors
 have students remain seated until bell rings
 allow only one student out at a time to use the restroom

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

We will use our MTV program to teach and discuss the state character traits.

Person Responsible Courtney Buchanan (buchac@bay.k12.fl.us)

Teacher will prevent and respond to behavior by:
reteaching expectations
using appropriate interventions (proximity, new seat, buddy classroom, redirect, etc.)
parent contact
discipline referral (last step)

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

School counselors and Triad team will:
institute "minute meetings" to determine student needs
meet with small groups of students with similar needs
attend behavior tier I/II/III meetings

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

Teachers will create a classroom management plan that aligns with our MTSS behavior framework that includes:
explicit and visible positive behavioral expectations for the classroom,
routines and procedures,
learning objectives,
rules and expectations, and
character education.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The SafeSchoolsforAlex dashboard reports discipline data in four categories. Mowat scored "Very Low" in three out of four: violent incidents, .60 per 100 students; Property incidents, 0.00 per 100 students; and drug/public order incidents, .36 per 100 students. Our overall data showed 1 incident per 100 students, which below the state average of 4.2 incidents per 100 students. We are ranked #1 in both the state and county for incidents against property with 0 incidents. Overall, we are ranked #54 out of 553 middle school/junior high schools. However we scored "very high" in total reported suspensions. We believe that our school-wide encouragement of "if you see something-say something" has kept students from some of the more egregious behavior. We also wondered if our high level of suspensions is a reason that we have relatively low numbers of serious incidents. Looking at our longitudinal data, it should be noted that we had a decrease in population of over 300 students in the 2018-2019 school year following Hurricane Michael. It shows a clear decrease in behavioral incidents, but that is in a large part due to the decline in population.

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.

Mowat has a PBIS program that we call G.O.L.D.E.N (Good manners, Ownership, Leadership, Diligence, Encouragement, Nobility/Niceness). All of our teachers teach lessons to all students at the beginning of the year regarding these six traits. We reteach these traits as needed to either individual or groups of students. Students who join us during the year join a class where they, too, receive lessons on these traits and our expectations. When students exhibit these traits, they can earn "GOLDEN tickets" from their teachers or any adult on campus. These tickets can be redeemed during our critical thinking class at our GOLDEN store, which is located in our cafeteria. In the past, we have had other rewards for GOLDEN students, such as field trips, pep rallies, and gatherings for movies or outdoor activities. However, the past few years with COVID, these activities have been curtailed. We have a group of teachers, school counselors, and administration who make up our school Tier I behavior team. This team meets for a few days in the summer where we discuss the GOLDEN lessons for the upcoming school year. In our monthly meetings we look at discipline data and discuss any on-going issues and try to look for solutions. Because of COVID concerns, we do not encourage volunteers or others on campus, which makes it difficult to reach out to stakeholders for anything other than contributions to our GOLDEN store.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The school has multiple groups who work toward building a positive culture and environment. The first is the School Leadership Team. In addition to the School Improvement Plan, this team of teachers and administrators work together to try to come up with strategies to address the concerns of all stakeholders. We also have a Tier I Behavior team and a Behavior Leadership Team (for Tier II/III) who work to address student behavior. At this time, we are continuing with virtual only meetings, which makes it more difficult for other stakeholders to have an impact at the school. All school administrators and school counselors have an open door policy for all stakeholders. We just do not hold large meetings.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00