

Hillsborough County Public Schools

East 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	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

East Bay High School

7710 OLD BIG BEND RD, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Amy Stevens Cox

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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)	94%
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: C (51%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

East Bay High School

7710 OLD BIG BEND RD, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[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	64%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

East Bay High School seeks to be focused on their continued efforts to reach student success through positive interactions with community members in a collective, goal driven culture.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Prepare a generation of students who believe in their strengths, abilities and their future.

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
Stevens-Cox, Amy	Principal	Oversee and manage the day to day operation of East Bay High School.
Gunn, Jonathan	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional programs and campus level operations.
Dougherty, Rebecca	SAC Member	To lead and assist in the preparation and evaluation of the results of the school improvement plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Amy Stevens Cox

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

94

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,911

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

10

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

8

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	498	462	492	453	1905	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	156	151	158	602	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	9	10	40	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	140	108	98	453	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	95	96	98	423	
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	0	0	0	8	8	5	7	28

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	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/12/2021

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	426	489	457	562	1934
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	171	171	208	727
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	12	7	10	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	12	7	5	8	32

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	42	0	0	0	42	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	426	489	457	562	1934
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	171	171	208	727
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	12	7	10	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	140	108	98	453
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	95	96	98	423

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	12	7	5	8	32

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	42	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				42%	56%	56%	46%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	54%	51%	54%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	41%	42%	46%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				36%	49%	51%	38%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				47%	48%	48%	43%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	45%	45%	31%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				53%	69%	68%	51%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				70%	75%	73%	69%	73%	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	42%	55%	-13%	55%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	41%	53%	-12%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

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	53%	66%	-13%	67%	-14%
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%	73%	-3%	70%	0%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	24%	63%	-39%	61%	-37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	44%	57%	-13%	57%	-13%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA data was compiled using Achieve 3000

Math data was compiled using algebra interim assessments and EOC data

Bio data was compiled using biology interim assessments and EOC data

Us History data was compiled using US history interim assessments and EOC data

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11.9	15.3	18.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.5	13.45	13.22
	Students With Disabilities	8.89	5.56	6.58
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27.2	31.5	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.7	32.4	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	26.6	31.7	n/a
	English Language Learners	31.4	22	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41.5	31.3	42.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.0	29.7	41.1
	Students With Disabilities	34.8	27.6	33.6
	English Language Learners	41.1	32.4	44.2
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.6	n/a	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	31.6	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	28.9	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	19.4	n/a	n/a

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27.75	26.90	27.14
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.46	25.79	25.73
	Students With Disabilities	17.57	18.37	13.59
	English Language Learners	5	4.55	4.55
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27.2	31.5	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.7	32.4	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	26.6	31.7	n/a
	English Language Learners	31.4	22	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41.5	31.3	42.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.0	29.7	41.1
	Students With Disabilities	34.8	27.6	33.6
	English Language Learners	41.1	32.4	44.2
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.6	n/a	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	31.6	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	28.9	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	19.4	n/a	n/a

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9.74	8.58	7.88
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.84	7.26	6.51
	Students With Disabilities	13.64	9.38	7.50
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27.2	31.5	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.7	32.4	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	26.6	31.7	n/a
	English Language Learners	31.4	22	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41.5	31.3	42.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.0	29.7	41.1
	Students With Disabilities	34.8	27.6	33.6
	English Language Learners	41.1	32.4	44.2
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.6	n/a	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	31.6	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	28.9	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	19.4	n/a	n/a

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27.2	31.5	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.7	32.4	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	26.6	31.7	n/a
	English Language Learners	31.4	22	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41.5	31.3	42.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.0	29.7	41.1
	Students With Disabilities	34.8	27.6	33.6
	English Language Learners	41.1	32.4	44.2
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.6	n/a	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	31.6	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	28.9	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	19.4	n/a	n/a

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	22	42	37	25	25	33	13	30		85	32
ELL	10	36	40	13	26	38	6	36		97	41
ASN	71	75								100	64
BLK	28	41	37	16	21	27	22	47		93	42
HSP	29	42	44	21	21	27	28	56		95	57

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	38	35		15	5		63	70		95	53
WHT	48	52	41	34	26	18	50	74		90	57
FRL	31	44	41	21	21	23	31	54		90	49
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	24	43	35	21	43	46	25	45		86	21
ELL	7	34	35	11	28	35	23	50		82	50
ASN	56	38		68	63		75	70		94	67
BLK	31	37	30	26	43	39	43	61		93	28
HSP	36	45	39	29	42	42	48	68		89	49
MUL	51	54		41	60		50	85		81	45
WHT	56	53	33	50	56	57	66	77		88	60
FRL	34	41	32	30	45	43	44	63		87	41
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	21	46	46	19	29	23	33	54		68	18
ELL	19	46	57	25	35	45	29	42		69	31
ASN	65	58		69	33		75	85			
BLK	38	47	41	32	39	24	42	67		88	25
HSP	41	53	45	33	39	42	44	63		83	43
MUL	68	63		47	42		57	76		70	63
WHT	53	59	53	47	51	27	62	77		80	49
FRL	39	52	47	33	40	30	43	62		80	36

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	35
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	78
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	37
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	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
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?

SWD and ELL students are performing below the federal index percentage level.

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

SWD and ELL student achievement levels on state based assessments needs to improve.

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

The academic content is not accessible for these subgroups of students. Teachers and professional developments will focus on designing lessons and activities that are scaffolded, differentiated, and engaging for students.

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

Math learning gains overall and math learning gains for the lowest 25 percentile showed the most improvement based on the 2019 assessment data.

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

There was a specific curriculum focus on this area during that school year. The math coach was involved in plc, standard analysis, and assessment preparation.

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

Instructional leaders will need to identify areas of student learning gaps and provide interventions to decrease these learning gaps and accelerate 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.

This year, the school will utilize a classroom walkthrough data tracking tool that will track trends in the classroom. The instructional leadership team will then use this data to provide professional development based off this data.

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

The school is specifically focused on increasing the effectiveness of PLCs. The effectiveness is being increased by focusing on assessment of learning by creating common assessments within specific subject areas. Teachers will then use this common assessment data to identify areas of focus. The PLCs will then come up with a plan of action during common planning to address the areas of focus.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on state assessment data, the students in the bottom quartile were achieving below the state average on the state assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	East Bay High School seeks to increase the learning gains of the bottom quartile by 10 points as a result of implementing strategies and utilizing resources to positively impact the educational achievement of this subgroup.
Monitoring:	The school will use interim, formative, baseline, classroom, and district/state assessment scores to monitor progress towards this goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development opportunities employed by both administration and faculty that focus on intervention strategies to positively impact students in the bottom quartile.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need professional learning that will specifically focus on impacting the learning gains of students in the bottom quartile.
Action Steps to Implement	
Hire a Teacher Leader to facilitate schoolwide strategies, conduct PD series on differentiation, assessment, and model frameworks for effective common planning and PLC sessions.	
Person Responsible	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)
ILT/admin will observe individual classrooms on a regular basis using the learning walk data collection tool to track teaching practices and find trends in data to provide timely professional development. Admin will conduct walkthroughs and ILT will use this data to develop and refine PD opportunities plus next steps.	
Person Responsible	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)
Departments will conduct PLCs bi-weekly that focus on common planning and assessments.	
Person Responsible	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)
Administration and teacher leaders will focus on training teachers how to effectively implement accommodations and differentiate instruction for SWD and ELL students.	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is a lack of positive relationships between teacher/faculty and some students as evident by student surveys.
Measurable Outcome:	East Bay High School will positively impact school culture by focusing on the social and emotional needs of students by collaborating with student services, using positive behavior intervention strategies with restorative practices, and providing mentoring led by student leaders and faculty.
Monitoring:	Students will be given quarterly surveys to assess the impact of climate and culture initiatives.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The PBIS team will implement a school wide PBIS initiative that focuses on reinforcing positive behaviors in students. Student Government will implement a process that will further build connective relationships among peers. Peer Jury will be trained to enhance a feeling of belonging and inclusion of "fringe" students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS strategies have been proven through research to decrease behavior incidents and improve the culture of schools.

Action Steps to Implement

A dean of Climate and Culture will be hire to lead the school wide PBIS initiative to improve culture, reduce behavior incidents, and help with the social emotional needs of students.

Person Responsible Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)

Teachers will identify student leaders to be recognized which will continue to encourage leadership among the student body.

Person Responsible Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)

Provide school counseling services at school-related functions to ensure easy access to counselors.

Person Responsible Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)

Hire a Student Success Coach whose job is to work with students who believe they cannot or will not graduate.

Person Responsible Jonathan Gunn (jonathan.gunn@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is a need for our students to obtain skills that will make them employable after high school. The students can obtain these skills by achieving certification credits in CTE courses.
Measurable Outcome:	East Bay High School will increase the number of students achieving acceleration on certifications exams through assessment preparation and specific instruction that is aligned with certification exams.
Monitoring:	Certification assessment data will be monitor to see if the overall percentage of students achieving acceleration credits on certification exams increases by 8 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide professional development that increases student engagement and motivation with a specific focus on courses that have certification exams.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In classroom, it was observed that students were not passing the certification exams because they were not engaged in class during instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration and Teacher Leaders will focus on training teachers how to effectively increase student engagement and motivation for learning.

Person Responsible Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)

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.

East Bay High School ranks as very high on the school incident ranking report. The school culture will be monitored by the Dean of Climate and Culture through surveys and monitoring of discipline data.

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.

The school's PBIS and the Dean of Climate and Culture is specifically focused on improving the school culture and promoting positive behavior in students. The Student Government Association is also focused on provide school wide activities and initiatives that increase inclusion and positive culture with students.

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

The school has a PBIS team lead by administration and teacher leaders to positively impact the school culture. All faculty and staff are involved in promoting the school wide PBIS initiative. The PBIS team has implemented a school wide token program where students are given Indian Bucks by faculty/staff for exhibiting positive behaviors. The students are allowed to redeem these Indian Bucks for edible treats every Friday. There are various other positive behavior promotion initiatives such as report card data chats, Student of the Quarter Awards, and tardiness prevention programs.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00