

Bay District Schools

J.R. Arnold High 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

J.R. Arnold High School

550 N ALF COLEMAN RD, Panama City Beach, FL 32407

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Britt Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
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 (55%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

J.R. Arnold High School

550 N ALF COLEMAN RD, Panama City Beach, FL 32407

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	48%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The MISSION of Arnold High School is to provide a rigorous educational experience which gives individual students relevant learning while fostering healthy relationships for lifelong success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The VISION of Arnold High School is that every student, every day, in every way will be actively engaged in pursuit of academic excellence to be college and career ready.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Britt	Principal	
Dunlap, Anji	Dean	
Bauer, Chris	Teacher, K-12	
Bell, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Green, Dia	Other	
Hurst, Jan	Teacher, K-12	
Ziem, Ryan	Teacher, K-12	
Whaler, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Hobbs, Amy	Dean	
Banton, Monica	Graduation Coach	
Gilliard, Allison	Teacher, K-12	
Nelson, Emily	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 2/1/2019, Britt Smith

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

1

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

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

76

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,505

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

17

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

19

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	0	0	0	0	418	406	352	319	1495
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	82	63	76	292
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	29	36	58	147
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	41	33	40	149
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	94	66	56	300
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	39	21	23	146
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	47	61	43	66	217

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	26	12	5	84
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	4	2	27

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/5/2021

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	62	71	42	269

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	22	14	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	5	4	30

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	62	71	42	269

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	22	14	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	5	4	30

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				56%	57%	56%	59%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	49%	51%	55%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	35%	42%	42%	37%	44%
Math Achievement				47%	58%	51%	66%	61%	51%
Math Learning Gains				46%	53%	48%	60%	62%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	50%	45%	54%	59%	45%
Science Achievement				67%	74%	68%	75%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	76%	73%	80%	74%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	63%	58%	5%	55%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	47%	53%	-6%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

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
2021					
2019	66%	71%	-5%	67%	-1%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	71%	74%	-3%	70%	1%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	25%	64%	-39%	61%	-36%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	58%	62%	-4%	57%	1%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

none

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	X	X	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	X	X	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	X	X	X
	Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X
	Students With Disabilities	X	X	X
	English Language Learners	X	X	X
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	23	36	27	25	31	26	36	47		93	28
ELL	18	36	33	17	19	23	36				
ASN	81	75					90				
BLK	23	32	26	18	10	8	23	53		86	58
HSP	45	32	22	33	25	18	62	64		100	67

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
MUL	73	65		59	57		83	65		94	56
WHT	59	51	30	46	39	31	70	82		96	63
FRL	42	43	29	35	28	23	52	71		91	57
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	32	31	17	33	33	50	57		86	13
ELL	30	39	42	45	38	18	43			75	
ASN	61	44		75	80		70				
BLK	28	39	50	34	36	38	63	40		71	33
HSP	42	28	20	33	29	8	47	67		86	46
MUL	55	41	17	33	34		63	36		88	57
WHT	59	46	45	51	49	36	69	78		88	67
FRL	51	39	33	39	39	26	61	66		80	48
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	42	41	47	56	50	33	65		79	55
ELL	35	46	47	76	54					50	
ASN	80	64								83	80
BLK	26	43	50	34	36		47	60		73	55
HSP	59	48	35	71	60		76	69		58	60
MUL	54	62	33	66	63		63	75			
WHT	61	56	44	67	62	53	78	83		88	75
FRL	46	47	40	60	63	59	66	72		79	70

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	54
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	598
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	86%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	30
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	82
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	34
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	69
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	57
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	47
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?

All groups show consistency through the years except students with disabilities.

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

Students with disabilities are slightly under-performing in ELA (category 1 and 2) versus state results, .4%. Students with disabilities are greatly under-performing in Math (category 1 and 2) versus state results, 15.2%.

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

Since 2018, students have had interrupted instruction due to circumstances beyond anyone's control. Therefore, the gaps in their learning have resulted in lower scores. Teachers are working to close these gaps that occurred over the course of multiple years in a year's time.

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

Social Studies and Science showed the greatest area of improvement. ELA is close to meeting the state results.

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

Social Studies and Science standards are often new at this level, while Math is a building block of skills.

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

The implementation of twice weekly Power Hour and math tutoring during lunches will give students and teachers additional time to work on students' gaps in learning.

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.

Faculty meetings will review and analyze Power Hour data. Students sign in to Power Hour via QR code, which allows for monitoring of the needs of students.

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

Summer school was offered between the 2020-21 and 2021-22 school year. Power Hour will allow us to track and assist those students who are on the D/F report and assist them prior to the reporting of grades for the semester. The Early Warning System will allow us to intervene earlier when students are struggling to help them reach mastery of standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order to ensure students are exposed to a guaranteed and viable curriculum, teachers need time to collaborate and create common lessons and analyze common assessment data. Utilizing the PLC time to plan lessons and reflect on assessment data will help boost student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers engage in quality professional development, collaborate, develop higher-order standards-based lessons that increase active engagement, then student learning gains will increase in reading, writing, and literacy across the disciplines. Our goal is to improve in the areas of proficiency and learning gains by at least 4 percentage points in ELA FSA and Math EOC scores and increase proficiency in Biology and U.S. History by focusing on developing a guaranteed and viable curriculum, sound lessons, and infusing literacy in all content areas.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring will occur through weekly PLC agendas/minutes, common assessment data, student grades, and the early warning system report.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anji Dunlap (dunlaac@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Embed collaboration in PLC teams to plan standards based instruction, plan common lessons, analyze student work and common assessments, and reflect on teaching based on DuFour's "Learning by Doing."
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students need to be exposed to the same content regardless of the class in which they are enrolled. By teachers working collaboratively in PLC teams and utilizing the district created pacing guides as well as content standards, students should have access to a guaranteed and viable curriculum.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet weekly in PLC groups.
2. Teachers will utilize the 4 questions set out in DuFour's "Learning by Doing."
3. Teachers will ensure standards based instruction by utilizing common assessment data to guide instruction.
4. Teachers will address literacy in all areas regardless of content area.

Person Responsible Britt Smith (smithjb@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Due to Hurricane Michael and the COVID-19 pandemic, students have had 3 years of interrupted education. To close the gaps in student learning, we will implement Power Hour one day a week to allow students to obtain additional instructional time in an area they feel they are struggling.

Measurable Outcome: If collaborative data teams (PLCs, MTSS, GAT, SIT, Admin Team) analyze multiple data sources, provide quality feedback to students, and implement appropriate remediation and enrichment strategies, then we will see a 5% decrease in the percentage of D's and F's for the 21-22 school year.

Monitoring: Teams will analyze common assessments to guide instruction, review data for the students in remedial reading courses (Applied Communications, Personal Career Development, and Liberal Arts), analyze the quarterly EWS data, and review Power Hour participation data monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Britt Smith (smithjb@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Data teams will utilize the Data-Driven Dialogue when analyzing school data. The Data-Driven Dialogue focuses on four phases. The first phase is making predictions before viewing the data. Phase II involves "going visual" (viewing the data visually), Phase III is making observations, and Phase IV involves making inferences based on the data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Due to three years of interrupted education, the school data is trending downward. It is important that we utilize a research-based strategy such as the Data-Driven Dialogue to dig deeply into the data to determine the root causes of the decrease in proficiency and learning gains and plan strategies to address those causes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLCs will meet weekly to plan sound lessons based on the content standards and pacing guides, develop and analyze common assessment data, reflect on teaching practices, and plan for reteaching and remediation.
2. Power Hour will be implemented every Thursday to provide all students the opportunity to get remediation/enrichment within the school day.
3. Data will be monitored monthly to reflect and plan for improvement (data will be reviewed during MTSS meetings, GAT meetings, weekly PLC meetings, school leadership team meetings, and by the administration team).
4. Professional development will be provided to teachers on instructional strategies to help students in the subgroup areas (training for utilization of ELlevation and Understanding Accommodations for our students with disabilities).

Person Responsible Britt Smith (smithjb@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to Behavior

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Behavior Goal: In order to increase student access to education and promote a positive school-wide social culture, our goal is to reduce exclusionary discipline practices by establishing a strong PBIS Tier I core. We will do this by encouraging expected behavior by consistent use of our token system (Key Cards) throughout all educational settings. To gain student buy-in, we plan to open a school store dedicated specifically for students to redeem their Key Cards for desired items.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, our goal is to decrease the number of days of out-of-school suspension and total number of referral incidents by 10%.
Monitoring:	We will pull reports quarterly to monitor the number of referrals and OSS data and compare to the 2019 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Britt Smith (smithjb@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our PBIS system and discipline matrix allows us to use consistent enforcement of student expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	OSS referrals was our highest category of discipline/behavioral issues compared to the other high schools in the district.

Action Steps to Implement

PBIS and Discipline Matrix data will be reviewed during common planning time and PLC meetings. Teachers and administrators will follow the process consistently and with high efficacy. Schoolwide use of visual reminders, as well as Wave TV reminders, will help students be aware of the expectations and consequences of acceptable and unacceptable behaviors.

Person Responsible Anji Dunlap (dunlaac@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.

Monthly attendance reports

Monthly EWS reports

MTSS-B data

School-wide passes to leave class

Power hour modified school schedule to reduce class time lost

8 keys of excellence for minimum behavior expectations

Positive behavior reinforcement strategy through key cards

Tardy roundup and dress code checks

Our goal is to maintain our low frequency of drug, violence, and property-related infractions. We are using a positive behavior model to reduce our number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions.

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.

Administration ensures that all faculty members are knowledgeable of Bay District Schools Guidelines and are trained in preventative strategies. At the beginning of each academic school year, all teachers are expected to review the Student Handbook with each class, establish academic expectations, communicate classroom norms that include policies and procedures, which includes teaching from bell to bell. Arnold High School established and enforces the practice of 'Freeze Time' where no student is allowed to leave a classroom for a period of 10 minutes at the beginning and end of each class. Arnold High School continues to embrace the 8 Keys of Excellence (Quantum Learning), and faculty members embed these expectations in the learning process. Arnold High School has a number of faculty members that are trained in Kagan Structures, and these structures are used on an ongoing basis as evidenced by lesson plans. Administration, Faculty, and staff are trained in the use of FOCUS as a behavioral management tool in an effort to increase awareness of referrals and/or concerns. MTSS is established and continues to identify students in need of interventions according to the established district-mandated behavioral matrix.

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

School Advisory Council consists of administration, teachers, parents, students, and community members.
 Collegiate Studies Parent Advisory Council

Efforts to communicate with parents, students, and community:

1. The School Advisory Committee meets monthly to inform parents of important issues and events.
2. Grades, attendance, and behavior reports are available to parents through Parent Portal
3. Teachers communicate lessons, objectives, and assessments through the use of Remind, Canvas, and Focus.
4. Athletic events, SAC meetings, student performances, and club activities are posted on the school web page and social media platforms.
5. Peachjar alerts are sent by phone as needed to inform parents, faculty, and staff of important events.
6. Prior to the beginning of the school year, incoming 9th graders and their parents are invited to Fish Camp for the purpose of touring the school, meeting teachers, and receiving important information regarding school policies and procedures.
7. School culinary department provides a meal at Open House.
8. Implementation of PBS (Positive Behavior System) school-wide.
9. Incorporation of social media to inform all stakeholders of current and upcoming school events/activities.
10. Scrolling informational signs are displayed at the front of the campus.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Behavior	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00