

Bay District Schools

Rosenwald High School



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	0

Rosenwald High School

924 BAY AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jonathan McQuagge

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	Alternative
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/28/2021.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Rosenwald High School will provide a safe, structured, and supportive environment that inspires students to stay in school and graduate ready for college or careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

EDUCATION. GRADUATION. DESTINATION.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

The population of Rosenwald High School is a 6-12 educational institution. The focus of Rosenwald is to provide credit recovery program for students who are in jeopardy of not completing high school. Rosenwald provides an unique opportunity for students to recover credits and return to a traditional school setting when appropriate.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McQuagge, Jonathan	Principal	Provides a common and clearly defined vision for the use of databased decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing and supporting the school-wide instructional plan with fidelity, ensures the implementation of interventions and supports and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support intervention implementation and communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.
Boyette, Crystal	Assistant Principal	Performs ongoing data collection and analysis to determine academic and social-emotional needs to the school; assist all teachers/paraprofessionals with professional development, serves as the advisor for curriculum and the implementation of academics and social-emotional learning programs.
James, Makeda	Other	Performs ongoing data collection and analysis to determine academic and social-emotional needs to the school; assist all teachers/paraprofessionals with professional development, serves as the advisor for curriculum and the implementation of academics and social-emotional learning programs.
Boutwell, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis, and evaluation, instruction/ interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring.
Allison, Michael	Other	Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis, and evaluation, instruction/ interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring.
Head, Debra	Teacher, K-12	Debra Head (Regular Education ELA and College Career Ready Teacher, Media Specialist, High School Dept. Chair) Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis, and evaluation, instruction/ interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring. Also, she serves on the district's ELA committee as our school liaison.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/2/2020, Jonathan Mcquagge

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

42

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

202

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

1

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

10

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	11	24	26	53	35	24	19	192	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	13	34	25	17	11	120	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	2	1	1	15	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	2	12	14	16	7	62	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	3	8	17	4	7	51	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	14	30	25	17	13	122	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	17	28	24	16	7	117	
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	6	16	13	28	26	20	12	121	

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	6	13	8	20	13	3	3	66	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	12	25	21	10	8	104	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/9/2021

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	8	26	31	42	39	24	19	189	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	19	30	27	20	13	128	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	21	21	19	11	5	99	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	9	4	31	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	9	5	32	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	21	28	27	15	14	128	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	24	26	23	9	8	108	

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	7	23	27	35	33	21	14	160	

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	3	3	4	13	8	3	0	34	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	24	20	19	13	9	100	

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					73%	61%		70%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					64%	59%		62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					58%	54%		55%	52%
Math Achievement					70%	62%		70%	61%
Math Learning Gains					57%	59%		59%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					56%	52%		62%	52%
Science Achievement					65%	56%		62%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					86%	78%		83%	77%

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					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019	13%	58%	-45%	55%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2021					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	22%	71%	-49%	67%	-45%
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	23%	74%	-51%	70%	-47%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	64%	-64%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	10%	62%	-52%	57%	-47%

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		9	20		24	53	8			60	
BLK	3	9			22	70		4		48	
HSP											
WHT		5			19		14			50	15
FRL	2	11	20		20	56	10	5		55	12
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										69	
BLK								7		35	17
WHT				7						24	40
FRL	7	17		3	46		19	24		36	26
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

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	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	175
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	76%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	17
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	0
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	13
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	19
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

Rosenwald meet monthly as graduation assistance team to discuss students performance and progress.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The most improvement was shown in the area of graduation. Rosenwald took steps to improve this area by meeting as a graduation team to discuss those students who were due to graduate.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

The greatest need of improvement is the blended learning model of the Edgenuity platform.

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

Rosenwald students are not meeting state testing requirements across the core testing areas. Which is a barrier for graduation.

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

Rosenwald administration and school leadership team will provide professional development opportunities with a focus on blended 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.

Rosenwald will provide trainings through Edgenuity coach/consultant. There will also be coaching cycles for new teachers throughout the 2021/2022 school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Area of Focus: Implement instruction focused on essential standards with a blended learning model
Rationale: Struggling students who are 2 or more years behind their kindergarten cohort and need strategic teaching

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The increased graduation rate of on-time graduates.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administration will monitor graduation plans and Edgenuity data to ensure students are making adequate progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan McQuagge
(mcquaj@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Continue the school-wide online learning curriculum and incorporate blended learning. (Edgenuity)

The on-line learning curriculum is focused on essential standards with blended learning to address individualized student needs. A data-focused curriculum that enables teachers to individualize instruction and meet the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Implementation of on-line curriculum school-wide with fidelity using coaching as classroom supports.
2. Monthly graduation team assistance meetings to progress monitor individual students and set a goal of graduating students within four years.
3. Administration will provide feedback following monthly classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible

Crystal Boyette
(boyetck@bay.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the

Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#2. Other specifically relating to P.L.C

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We will build the capacity of our leadership team members and meet with teachers individually in order to increase student achievement. We will accomplish this by collaborating with other staff members, reviewing data weekly, and formulating ideas in a structured format.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Course completions, grade promotions, and graduation rate.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The principal in collaboration with the assigned administrators and PLC teacher leaders will monitor Edgenuty teacher and student data to ensure that progress is being made towards goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan McQuagge (mcquaj@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our goal is to increase student achievement by the use of the Edgenuty learning platform. We will accomplish this by collaborating with other staff members, reviewing data weekly, and developing ideas in a structured format.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The rationale for choosing this strategy is Rosenwald is an alternative educational setting. Rosenwald would like to improve the schools graduation rate by utilizing a research based learning platform, Edgenuty. This is a proven program that has been deemed successful in the alternative educational setting.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#3. Other specifically relating to Behavior

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

After the review of discipline data it was determined that an area of focus should be to improve classroom disruptions within Rosenwald. The data that the largest number of referrals were in this discipline category.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Rosenwald is going to decrease the number of classroom disruptions by 10% for the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

School leadership team will meet monthly to review discipline data provided via Focus and PBIS team will review data and implement school wide lessons to improve areas of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Boyette (boyetck@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rosenwald will be using the program Strong Kids delivered by professional counselors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Strong Kids is an age appropriate researched based Social Emotional learning curriculum.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

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.

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.

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

Rosenwald High School will involve parents, families, and other community stakeholders with ongoing planning, and implementation of our Positive Behavior Interventions and Support program (PBIS). Surveys will be conducted of various stakeholders to include faculty/staff, students, parents, and community members to ensure the engagement of positive activities that will include incentives and rewards.

Rosenwald has established a partnership with the City of Panama City that will provide beautification projects, mentors, guest speakers, and financial support when needed for activities. Partnerships with community businesses are being established that will contribute throughout the school year to our faculty and students as part of PBIS.