

Bay District Schools

Bay 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	12
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Bay High School

1200 HARRISON AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Blythe Carpenter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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 (57%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (49%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

Bay High School

1200 HARRISON AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

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

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
May, Billy	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making and ensures that the school-based team is implementing necessary programs and district initiatives. He also ensures that necessary professional development is available for all stakeholders and oversees the Administration and Guidance Depts. Respon: Admin/Teacher duty assignments, Campus supervision schedule, Dept. Head meetings, S.R.O duty assignment,
Palfrey, Kris	Assistant Principal	Oversees the Title 1 Budget, Science and S.S Dept. Oversees Curriculum guides;Construction (new & renovations), Safety,Dual Enrollment, Newsletter, Faculty & Student Handbook, Technology, Teacher Trainin/Staff Dev, Textbook
Jones, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Oversees and monitors the SIP process and team to ensure that the goals developed by Bay High stakeholders support the mission and vision. Oversees: CTE Dept and Special Area Dept,Volunteer Program,Covid Administrator, Attendance, Facilities, Custodial Suppor
Craft, Barbara	Assistant Principal	Serves as the Administrator over the Guidance Dept. and ensures that our underserved and first-generation students have access to vital tools to reach all possible post-high school options.Oversees: Career Education, Honors Ceremony Recognition (getting sponsors), Master schedule, Service- Learning Coordinator, testing coordination
Brown, Adam	Other	Teaches: Read/Write music, Band, Instru Techn, Orch 6 Hon, Understanding Music, Jazz, oversees Summer Band Camp, performs at various functions.
Grady, Michael	Other	Assistant Administrator, Athletic Director, Athletic Security, Athletic Physical/ Parent Permission, Booster clubs, Volunteer Pro (Athletics)
Fowler, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	Provides information about core instruction, participates in making sure that Tier 1 instruction is being implemented. She also leads PLCs. She currently teaches: Holocaust, AICE U.S.History, and US History II.
Todd, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Provides information about core instruction, participates in making sure that Tier 1 instruction is being implemented and student data is collected and analyzed. She also leads PLC's, Homecoming activities, and SGA (Elections, Procedures, etc), and is a member of the Bay High Steering Committee. She currently teaches AICE Eng.Lit 1, AICE Thinking Skills, and AICE English General paper
Wiggins, Pam	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Wiggins provides information about core instruction, participates in making sure that Tier 1 instruction is being implemented and student data is collected and analyzed. If needed, she collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		She also serves as leads for PLCs. She currently teaches Pre-AICE and AICE physics, Physical Sci Hon, and Environmental Science

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/12/2010, Blythe Carpenter

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

2

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

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,109

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

9

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	0	0	0	306	281	254	254	1095	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	56	65	59	276	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	50	56	42	242	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	35	81	57	203	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	53	67	61	208	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	103	104	73	369	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	58	50	37	238	
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	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	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	97	91	113	81	382

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	33	26	47	117	223	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	26	9	55	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 9/11/2021

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	89	66	48	279

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	6	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	13	6	39	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	89	66	48	279	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	13	6	39

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				53%	57%	56%	46%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	49%	51%	42%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	35%	42%	31%	37%	44%
Math Achievement				44%	58%	51%	51%	61%	51%
Math Learning Gains				46%	53%	48%	56%	62%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	50%	45%	52%	59%	45%
Science Achievement				83%	74%	68%	56%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				70%	76%	73%	70%	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	54%	58%	-4%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	48%	53%	-5%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

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	84%	71%	13%	67%	17%
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	70%	74%	-4%	70%	0%
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	53%	62%	-9%	57%	-4%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We do not use MAP at the high school level

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

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

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

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	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
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	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	17	22	20	36	42	56	23	42		85	30
ELL	3	18	22	5	8					95	33
BLK	25	29	23	17	24	41	24	36		93	46
HSP	25	37	28	21	28	20	38	58		97	58
MUL	33	31		38			69	65		95	72

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
WHT	49	37	25	53	31	30	64	73		93	72
FRL	29	29	25	26	28	31	38	44		93	61
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	36	53	49	36	35	27	64	35		92	24
ELL	14	15	14	5						67	42
ASN	69	44									
BLK	27	34	31	21	38		62	35		84	58
HSP	43	35	28	43	44		92	82		70	47
MUL	57	62		36	50		83	63		94	65
WHT	64	59	44	53	47	43	85	83		86	81
FRL	48	45	35	38	42	36	80	65		79	63
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	29	18	25	53		28	73		67	25
ELL	3	20	25	23	60		21			45	
ASN	69	36								100	90
BLK	26	36	31	28	47	40	34	53		67	57
HSP	32	35	26	51	65		35	54		68	71
MUL	46	53		62	56		58	67		87	75
WHT	57	45	31	64	58	63	69	82		84	78
FRL	37	38	27	41	51	43	44	61		70	65

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	25
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	87%
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	26
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	
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	36
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	40
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	58
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	53
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	40
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.

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

ELA- There was only a 1% difference between Bay High and the State. It is concerning that the 10th grade(cohort) proficiency for both the school and the district decreased by 5%. It poses the question, " What is the problem district wide that has caused the decrease of 5% proficiency"?

BIOLOGY- Bay High scored 84% proficiency; better than both district(74%), and state(67%)

HISTORY- Bay High scored 70% proficiency, equal to the state score, but less than district, 74%

ALGEBRA- Bay High scored 25%, much lower than both district (64%), and state (61%)

GEOMETRY- Bay High scored 53% proficiency, lower than both district (62%) and state (57%)

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

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

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

Algebra 1 and 1B were split which resulted in low scores. Currently extra supports need to be put in place for Algebra 1A classes; PD, TNTP. It seems that students are coming from 8th with low math scores and the majority of these students have poor attendance and discipline issues. Focusing on these low achieving student's additional issues may contribute to increase proficiency. Provide additional supports to Algebra 1A teachers.

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

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

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

The improvement was due to AICE students testing in this subject. No new actions will be put in place.

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

- PD for teachers regarding accelerating learning,
 - Self Efficacy
 - Prior Knowledge- Key prior knowledge is provided ahead of time, enabling students to connect to new information
 - Relevance- Teachers treat relevance as a critical component to student motivation and memory.
 - Connection to core class- Instruction is connected to core class, and ongoing collaboration is emphasized.
 - Pacing and direction- Active, fast-paced, hands on; forward movement - the goal being for students to learn on time with peers.
- PLC teachers focusing on student achievement and how to help those that are making adequate progress.

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.

District Resources will be used to deliver ongoing PD regarding Acceleration vs Remediation.

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

Continued PD - Staff Meetings, PLC , and content area groups.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Bay High School Professional Learning Communities, PLCs, will serve as a forum whereby instructional practices are improved and student achievement is monitored to increase the graduation rate at Bay High School. Active involvement in the PLC process will positively impact our rigor, relationships and responsibilities.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Instructional Staff will attend 90% of scheduled PLC meetings and 100% of teachers will perform all PLC responsibilities.</p> <p>Participation in the PLC process will facilitate in achieving the following goals: To improve student reading proficiency levels by 12% in the lowest 25% (ELA) with an emphasis on ELL as measured by the FSA assessment by the end of SY 2021-2022.</p> <p>Decrease student discipline referrals by 10% as measured by FOCUS by end of SY 2021-2022.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>PLCs will meet, at a minimum, once a week</p> <p>An administrator will actively serve on each PLC that is organized</p> <p>All agendas will be distributed, a minimum of 24 hours in advance of a scheduled PLC</p> <p>All meeting minutes will be housed in Google Drive (shared with everyone)</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Billy May (maybs@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:	Professional learning communities tend to serve two broad purposes: (1) improving the skills and knowledge of educators through collaborative study, expertise exchange, and professional dialogue, and (2) improving the educational aspirations, achievement, and attainment of students through stronger leadership and teaching. Professional learning communities function as a form of action research as a way to continually question, reevaluate, refine, and improve teaching strategies and knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

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

Person Responsible Michael Grady (gradym1@bay.k12.fl.us)

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

All meeting minutes will be housed in Google Drive (shared with everyone)

Adhere to PLC Norms

Person
Responsible Billy May (maybs@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase Reading Proficiency in Lowest 25% with Emphasis on subgroup of ELL : One of the critical areas that we scored poorly in was that of the lowest 25th percentile in ELA. Currently we have 270 LV 1 students and while this is down from last year, we need to decrease this even further. Academic success in reading is imperative if students are to accomplish academic excellence in all content areas, leading to enhanced FSA scores, and laying a very strong foundation leading to college and career readiness. Our goal is to provide necessary professional development in close reading, student feedback, and cultural sensitivity, so that our faculty and staff become equipped with the necessary strategies to foster increased academic achievement. This year we have increased our awareness of our ELL population and their very specific needs, as they are the single subgroup that did not attain the 41% threshold. Thus we are targeting all of our lowest 25% but with a focus on the ELL subgroup.

Measurable Outcome: To improve student reading proficiency levels by 12% in the lowest 25% (ELA) with an emphasis on ELL as measured by the FSA assessment by end of SY 2021-2022

Monitoring: The desired outcome will be measured through :PLC's, monitoring lesson plans , and classroom observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Jones (joneslm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Providing feedback and goal setting opportunities to students, focusing on the lowest 25% of our student population with emphasis on our ELL population

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Hattie and Timperley (2007) feedback is one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement, but this impact can be either positive or negative. They developed a model of effective feedback that identifies the particular properties and circumstances that make it work. Feedback on task, process and self regulation level is far more effective than on the Self-level (e.g. praise wich contains no learning information). Descriptive feedback is closely related to providing formative assessment (see above). In an interview Hattie emphasized that the most powerful feedback is that given from the student to the teacher. This feedback allows teachers to see learning through the eyes of their students. It makes learning visible and facilitates the planning of next steps. The feedback that students receive from their teachers is also vital. It enables students to progress towards challenging learning intentions and goals. Hattie's hinge point for feedback is 0.73, and for goals it's 0.56; we know that anything above .4 yields gains

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

#3. Other specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Discipline: Disruptive behavior by one student also encourages other students to do the same, which compromises the teacher's authority and ability to control the group. The learning process for other students is affected when one or more students behave in a disruptive manner. Constant interruptions can interfere with the ability to learn.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease student discipline referrals by 10% as measured by FOCUS by end of SY 2021-2022
Monitoring:	Teacher steering committee and PLC's(Red Pride)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Grady (gradym1@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement Behavioral Intervention Program: Red Pride
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The aspects listed in the "Action Steps" section are components of a behavioral program. According to Hattie this has a 0.62 hinge point.

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

District Coaches and Behavior team will continue to offer support to our students and teachers as needed.

Person Responsible Kris Palfrey (palfkr1@bay.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible Barbara Craft (craftba@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.

Bay High data(2019-2020) is as follows:

Violent Incidents-LOW (Harassment, Physical Attack, Sexual Harassment) ranks county 3/5 per 100 students is 0.47 and state 132/505

Property Incidents- HIGH (Vandalism 0.08, Arson), B & E and Burglary 0, Larceny Theft or Motor Vehicle) ranks county 4/5 per 100 students 0.09, and state 383/505

Drug/Public Order Incidents (Tobacco, Drug use or Possession, except alcohol, Alcohol, and other major offenses) ranks county 4/5 per 100 stu 3.2 and state 391/505

Total Reported Suspension - VERY HIGH Bay High reported 27.0 vs states 13.5; suspensions per 100students is 27.0, county rank 4, state rank 459; ISS- 194 and OSS - 92

From 2014 to 2018 B.H rates were higher than state. But, 2019 the gap dramatically decreased: state was 3.3 and BH was 3.6

Our primary concern has already been stated in the " Area of Focus" and deals with decreasing discipline referrals. Our secondary area of concern, through the eyes of the data, is the "Very High" rating of reported suspensions. The leadership team, steering committee and PLC's will identify students (repeat offenders) that are getting out of school suspensions, and ISS and formulate a plan of action that includes: students, students parents, guidance counselors, district resources,SAC, MTSS, Present Team and Triad team members . The goal will be to find the root that causes the behavior and put applicable supports in place.

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.

Bay High School seeks to have parental involvement in all areas of student activities, both curricular and co-curricular. Our target is to make known to parents the benefits of participation and support of our students. This is done through regular updates to the Bay District school website , Everbridge alerts, a quarterly newsletter, Bay High School Facebook page, Bay High School's Twitter account, and Remind101 for seniors. Parents are strongly encouraged to participate in and or attend parent/teacher conferences, Open House, Parent Workshops, and SAC meetings in which they will learn about curriculum used, what levels students are expected to achieve, about the FSA and other assessments and how the results are used. Also, all parents are given

the opportunity to complete an online and paper based Title 1 Spring Parent Survey. The results are tallied and shared with the faculty and during a SAC meeting. Based on the surveys and review of parent input forms, changes are made to the PFEP for the next school year. The PFEP is reviewed throughout the year to meet the needs of the parents and school. During SAC meetings, results from a comprehensive needs assessment are discussed. Strategies from the current year's SIP are reviewed by all stakeholders. Revisions are made based on parent input. This year we are also focusing on exposing our students, faculty and staff to various cultures through exciting activities. Also we now offer 2 new Social Studies courses-African American History and Holocaust History to build empathy and understanding, we have the StreetLights group-serving our homeless students; AICE students who serve at Chautauqua assisting the early adult mentally challenged students and building tolerance; our SGA class mentors with Building 13 students (Special Needs students) 1x/week building empathy and peer relationships , and we have "Start With Hello"- lessons in SGA class to break down barriers of social isolation and promote inclusion throughout the school.

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

Administrators- provide direction, feedback regarding where we are in terms of "culture and environment", and provide opportunities to discuss where we want to be and how we are going to get there. Teachers & Counselors- provide shared leadership and work with administrators, faculty and staff to promote a positive culture and environment through applicable training. Para's, SRO, Lunchroom workers all join in to promote a positive culture by actively participating in Red Pride and other initiatives. Parents provide feedback regarding what they see and feel in terms of their kids education, resources, safety, socio-emotional wellbeing and are invited to volunteer and attend our SAC 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: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00