

Bay District Schools

Rutherford High School



2022-23 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rutherford High School

1000 SCHOOL AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Mitchell

Start Date for this Principal: 8/8/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: D (38%) 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rutherford High School

1000 SCHOOL AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Rutherford High School (RHS) is to meet the diverse needs of all students by providing a challenging, rigorous, and relevant curriculum in a safe and engaging learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at RHS is that all students can learn, achieve and succeed. Moreover, all students, faculty, and staff are entitled to a safe environment conducive to teaching and learning. Students should be prepared to succeed in a global society through college and career preparation. Students should commonly benefit from their community of learners and the educators who are committed to professional growth, educational innovation, and technological advancement. All stakeholders are responsible for nurturing this environment of safe, engaging learning, mutual trust, and respect.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mitchell, Robert	Principal	Mr. Mitchell is the building level supervisor for all faculty and staff.
Bylsma, Cody	Assistant Principal	Mr. Bylsma is the assistant principal over scheduling and counseling.
Wroblewski, Cheri	Assistant Principal	Ms. Wroblewski is the assistant principal over school-wide assessment.
Boyette, Crystal	Principal	Ms. Boyette is the building level supervisor for middle school faculty and staff.
Roulhac, Tanja	Assistant Principal	Ms. Roulhac is the assistant principal over facilities.
Henry, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Brayboy is a high school teacher in the CTE department.
Bates, Diane	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Bates is a high school IB math teacher.
Clayton, Billie	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Clayton is a high school math teacher.
Harris, Alicia	School Counselor	Mrs. Harris is a school counselor for middle school students.
Mcpherson, Corrie	Teacher, K-12	Ms. McPherson is a high school social studies teacher.
Rutland, Cathy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Rutland is the IB Coordinator.
Austin, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Austin is a high school English teacher.
Morris, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Morris teaches high school math.
Davey, Aubrey	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Davey is an ELL teacher
Manning, Evony	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Manning is a middle school science teacher.
Sanlor, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Sanlor teaches middle school civics.
Bryant, Erica	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Bryant teaches middle school ELA.
Johnson, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Johnson is an ESE push-in teacher.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barron, Beverly	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Barron is a high school science teacher.
Wilcox, Dorces	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Wilcox is a middle school ELA teacher.
Crooks, Brian	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Crooks is a middle school ELA teacher.
Davenport, Vic'Toria	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Davenport is a middle school math teacher.
Brantley, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Brantley teaches middle and high school technology.
Beggs, Melissa	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Beggs is an ESE push-in teacher.
McKay, Don	Administrative Support	Mr. McKay is a middle school administrator over safety and security.
Adams, Michelle	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Adams is an ESE push-in teacher.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/8/2022, Robert Mitchell

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

104

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,327

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

27

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

27

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	175	186	171	260	222	171	151	1336
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	84	62	94	65	54	46	473
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	94	73	89	63	32	30	441
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	14	18	39	57	29	41	218
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	31	45	33	58	35	44	265
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	86	84	122	80	62	44	553
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	110	99	121	52	31	20	548
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	89	113	94	126	104	64	62	652

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	10	22	17	54	50	20	2	175
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	16	28	31	12	15	132

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/8/2022

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	42	70	28	60	72	40	7	319
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	37	18	33	33	19	6	177
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	40	12	33	28	15	4	156
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	20	4	37	65	24	6	166
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	16	43	46	18	2	178
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	23	6	18	17	26	3	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	29	9	18	13	11	2	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	3	1	0	1	0	21

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	38	51	20	53	59	32	7	260

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	1	0	0	4	5	2	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	4	4	1	16

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	42	70	28	60	72	40	7	319
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	37	18	33	33	19	6	177
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	40	12	33	28	15	4	156
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	20	4	37	65	24	6	166
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	16	43	46	18	2	178
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	23	6	18	17	26	3	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	29	9	18	13	11	2	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	3	1	0	1	0	21

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	38	51	20	53	59	32	7	260

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	1	0	0	4	5	2	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	4	4	1	16

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	26%	52%	51%				39%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	33%						37%	49%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						21%	35%	42%
Math Achievement	18%	33%	38%				33%	58%	51%
Math Learning Gains	30%						43%	53%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						40%	50%	45%
Science Achievement	32%	53%	40%				54%	74%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	50%	56%	48%				65%	76%	73%

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	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	59%	71%	-12%	67%	-8%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	66%	74%	-8%	70%	-4%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	39%	64%	-25%	61%	-22%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	31%	62%	-31%	57%	-26%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	12	24	24	13	29	30	16	21		68	39
ELL	13	20	5	12	27	38	20	33			
ASN	52	50		35	58		55	67			
BLK	16	29	38	10	27	35	21	45	8	92	33
HSP	29	32	16	21	29	33	46	50	29	77	50
MUL	28	36	31	20	38	70	21	43		86	50
WHT	31	35	32	23	30	33	36	53	37	85	42
FRL	22	34	34	16	30	36	27	46	31	85	31

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	12	18	20	17	27	31	22	32		82	34
ELL	11	16	25	14	22	25	25	22			
ASN	48	30		39	7		62				
BLK	18	22	19	11	19	19	21	49	42	94	34
HSP	30	30	23	22	21	31	42	48		80	42
MUL	25	29	23	18	18	18	33	45		81	38
WHT	33	33	30	35	38	35	43	51	57	87	48
FRL	24	26	24	21	27	27	32	46	53	87	47

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	11	26	17	21	35	29	8	36		80	17
ELL	19	22	18	14	54						
ASN	47	40		55	64		75			90	44
BLK	26	28	18	25	38	36	30	56		72	15
HSP	18	27	10		29	38				67	
MUL	34	45		50	71		54	70		89	41
WHT	53	45	29	40	45	48	67	70		78	39
FRL	34	33	19	31	44	39	47	60		71	27

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	90%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	23
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	3

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%	0

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	53
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Academics:

When looking at our FSA data for middle school students, sixth grade had the only increase in proficiency when compared to last year. The rest of the grade levels and subject areas decreased by at least 1%.

For grades 9-10, reading proficiency went up 1%, while math decreased by 9%.

Out of our EOCs, Bio, US History, Alg 1, and Geometry all had a decrease in proficiency when compared to last year. Civics had the only increase, by 2%.

Behavior:

Our middle school data shows that there were 1,768 referrals last school year, which was a 27% increase from the previous year. The main discipline code was skipping on campus (19%). The high school students had 978 DRs, which was a 45% increase from the previous year. The main discipline code was skipping on campus (31%).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

According to our data, Geometry EOCs showed the largest decrease in proficiency (-11%). Our ELA proficiency and learning gains were also low across the school. We believe that increasing reading proficiency will also improve math proficiency and gains.

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

Contributing factors include COVID outbreaks, which limited classroom instruction, the lack of Geometry Honors courses in middle school, and direct differentiated instruction during reading.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

sixth grade ELA proficiency increased along with our Civics EOCs.

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

We had consistent teachers, curriculum, offered Saturday school sessions, along with bootcamps.

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

We will implement ESE push-in support across campus.

Our staff will identify and focus on lowest 25%.

We will implement a Homeroom for intervention/enrichment for grades 9-12.

Each middle school students will have critical thinking for intervention/enrichment.

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.

The district level Instructional Specialist will provide ongoing, job-embedded professional learning to leaders and teachers on the mechanical use of the district adopted curriculum, standards based lesson planning expectations, engaging instructional practices and strategies, data analysis and planning for interventions and roles and responsibilities of grade-level PLCs.

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

Targeted support will be provided in order to accelerate the learning through targeted, individualized instruction. The students of Bay District schools have experienced extensive hardships as we continue to re-build through a global pandemic following category 5 Hurricane Michael. Students have significant unfinished learning due to these circumstances. The support and resources that will be provided will enable our students to master prerequisite skills as they continue to learn grade-level concepts and standards. As the students' achievement gaps close, additional resources and support will be faded. Bay District schools will continue to provide Tiered supports and services based on school and student needs. Our Assessment and Accountability Department works closely with our Curriculum and Instruction Department to

ensure that student progress across the district is closely monitored. As learning gaps are identified the district and school based teams will work collaboratively to ensure that students and staff are receiving the support necessary to successfully demonstrate mastery of the standards. These supports will include district based academic coaches, new teacher coaches and support, school based literacy coaches, school based interventions, on-going professional development and targeted individualized interventions as needed.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Across all grades and subject levels, our students struggle with critical reading and textual analysis as evidenced by our assessment scores. Our goal is to improve student achievement in research, communication, and critical thinking skills as referenced in the International Baccalaureate Organization's Approaches to Learning (ATL) framework. Success in these skill areas form the basis for student classroom engagement.

All of our teachers, regardless of subject area, teach students research skills---how to find information, to evaluate the source and quality of that information, and how to balance information from multiple sources to reach a logical conclusion. All of our teachers teach critical thinking---from direct problem-solving to mindful reflection when they have an increase in understanding. And, all of our teachers teach communication----subject specific vocabulary, reading and text analysis, writing, speaking, and listening. An increased recognition and deliberate emphasis of these skills in every subject area will lead to improved student achievement in standardized test scores. Teacher collaboration in Professional Learning Communities to share successful approaches to teaching in these areas will improve student engagement and enable our students to demonstrate academic growth in critical reading and analysis in all subject areas.

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

Student Outcome: In order to improve our overall student achievement, teachers will collaborate as part of PLCs to share successful teaching practice and develop effective common assessments in one or more of the ATL areas of research, critical thinking, and communication skills. Teachers will engage students in weekly formative practice interacting with subject appropriate material, provide quality guidance and feedback to improve performance, reflect on both process and outcome, and implement remediation and/or enrichment strategies as necessary, including policies and procedures noted in the APP manual. As a result, we will see a 10 % increase in our local, state, and national test scores.

Instructor Outcome: Teachers who demonstrate evidence of meeting these criteria through classroom observation, submission of student work samples, and assessment data, will achieve an effective/highly effective rating as part of their professional evaluation. Our outcome goal will be that 75% of faculty members will earn ratings of effective or higher in domain 3c of the Charlotte Danielson's framework for teaching.

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

Administrators will observe PLC groups and review weekly responses to DeFour's 4 Essential PLC questions, classroom observations, student work samples, and assessment scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Weekly PLC Meetings, varying among Content, Grade-level, and Vertical articulation. Our Professional Learning Communities consist of teachers, counselors, support personnel, and administrators. PLC groups share classroom approaches to teaching and analyze

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

data in these skill sets across each of these groups and reflect on ways to improve student performance, collaborating on plans to vary instruction, implement accommodations and support student achievement. Participation and attendance at these meetings plus samples of student formative work and summative assessments provide evidence of support for this goal.

Content area PLC's will meet at least three times per month to provide the greatest opportunity for small group collaboration. Larger grade level and/or vertical teams will meet at least once per quarter to discuss students of concern and subject progression across grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teacher collaboration and communication leads to improved confidence and classroom instruction, which in turn, leads to greater student engagement and improved performance. If teachers feel they have the support of their colleagues and administration, guided by proven approaches to teaching, these supports will enable them to successfully guide their students to higher achievement levels in critical reading and analysis..

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.

Teachers will meet weekly in PLC groups with different teachers assuming different roles to ensure a balance of participation and engagement.

Person Responsible Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

Each PLC group will complete and submit their responses to DuFour's questions each week.

Person Responsible Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

Administrators and school leaders will provide support and guidance to mentor teachers to ensure they have the resources, and training necessary to carry out their responsibilities.

Person Responsible Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

The UChicago Five Essentials survey will be given to all stakeholders at the end of the school year as a measure to evaluate the effectiveness of this goal.

Person Responsible Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Behavior

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For the 22-23 school year, our focus will be to continue to build a positive school culture through implementation of our Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program. PBIS initiatives will recognize and reward students for exhibiting the RAMS expectations; fostering a positive culture and environment specifically related to behavior. Based on our discipline data, we want to focus attention to tardies/skipping on campus as our primary area of focus.

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

Measurable Outcome: We will decrease the number of referrals for skipping on campus by 10% in both middle and high school.

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

Monitoring: Discipline data is reviewed and discussed as part of the monthly data chats. The number of students with discipline referrals, types of infractions and number of suspension days are evaluated and discussed at these meetings.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cody Bylsma (bylsmdc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS initiatives will recognize and reward students for exhibiting the RAMS expectations; fostering a positive culture and environment specifically related to behavior. Increased awareness of the PBIS platform with all stakeholders will lead to greater participation and positive outcomes.

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS is a research-based program that, if implemented with fidelity, can help improve the school culture and environment specifically related to behavior.

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.

PBIS Professional Development
Person Responsible Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

Student Program Training
Person Responsible Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

Distribution of Student Badges
Person Responsible Jessica Brantley (brantjj@bay.k12.fl.us)

SAC and Community Partner Sponsorships

Person Responsible Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

Teacher Rewards

Person Responsible Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

Student attendance rewards

Person Responsible Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

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

We want to target differentiation for the Lowest 25% of students to increase learning gains and proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of our lowest quartile will show learning gains, as measured on state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The FAST progress monitoring tool for ELA and math will be used to measure and monitor student success. For our juniors and seniors, we will use Applied Comms coursework as progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

- Instructional coaches for ELA and math
- Weekly student data chats
- Monthly professional development for teachers focusing on student needs
- Critical Thinking/Intervention/Extension (Climb Time) built into the master schedule

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Utilizing these evidence-based strategies will lead to filling gaps in students' knowledge and improving performance and proficiency.

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.

Build Critical Thinking/Intervention/Extension (Climb Time) into the master schedule

Person Responsible Cody Bylsma (bylsmc@bay.k12.fl.us)

Progress monitor/track diagnostic data

Person Responsible Robert Mitchell (mitchrt@bay.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A as we are a 6-12 school

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A as we are a 6-12 school

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A as we are a 6-12 school

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A as we are a 6-12 school

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A as we are a 6-12 school

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A as we are a 6-12 school

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A as we are a 6-12 school

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A as we are a 6-12 school

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

RHS seeks to promote a positive school culture and environment that reflects a supportive and fulfilling learning environment with conditions that meet the needs of all students. Moreover, we will empower faculty & staff who are confident in their roles and relationships to students. We seek a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. We will consult with a variety of stakeholders to employ school improvement strategies that impact our growing positive school culture.

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

We intend to involve and recruit stakeholders who are more proximal to the school; including teachers, students, parents and the families of students, volunteers and mentors, school board members, and community partners such as early childhood providers, local colleges and universities, social services, and business partners. At RHS, we understand that stakeholders play a key role in our school's performance and in addressing equity. Our involvement of every stakeholder is crucial for the achievement of our stated vision, mission, values, goals, and school improvement strategies.