

Bay District Schools

# J.R. Arnold High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# J.R. Arnold High School

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

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Britt Smith**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# J.R. Arnold High School

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

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	36%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	B	B	B

## 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 Arnold High School is to provide a rigorous educational experience that gives individual students relevant learning while fostering healthy relationships for lifelong success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

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

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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
Smith, Britt	Principal	
Dunlap, Anji	Dean	
Green, Dia	Other	
Nelson, Emily	Teacher, K-12	
Bell, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Hurst, Jan	Teacher, K-12	
Green, Sean	Teacher, K-12	
Bauer, Chris	Teacher, K-12	
Goss, Brandi	Teacher, K-12	
Flaig, Donka	School Counselor	
Splain, Rylan	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 2/1/2019, Britt Smith

**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.*

70

**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**

72

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,629

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

16

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

19

**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	0	0	0	0	470	415	410	337	1632
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	80	100	81	399
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	65	76	26	240
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	28	48	39	136
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	50	46	37	151
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	106	115	59	371
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	49	37	19	185
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	0	0	0	0	82	91	107	60	340

**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	0	0	0	0	35	30	23	7	95
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	17	10	5	42



**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/9/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	61	43	66	217

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

**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	47	61	43	66	217

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	53%	52%	51%				56%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						44%	49%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						38%	35%	42%
Math Achievement	49%	33%	38%				47%	58%	51%
Math Learning Gains	54%						46%	53%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						33%	50%	45%
Science Achievement	64%	53%	40%				67%	74%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	56%	48%				73%	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

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
2022					
2019	66%	71%	-5%	67%	-1%

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	71%	74%	-3%	70%	1%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	25%	64%	-39%	61%	-36%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	58%	62%	-4%	57%	1%

**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	20	27	21	30	46	48	41	29		88	43
ELL	32	40	40	35	58	55	58	47		100	38
ASN	71	33		64				85			
BLK	15	36	35	31	53	47	35	41		100	38
HSP	44	51	48	55	58	38	64	58		100	56
MUL	58	48		48	47		53	84		91	81
WHT	57	49	27	51	54	46	67	73		95	67
FRL	40	42	31	42	52	50	57	65		92	51
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	23	36	27	25	31	26	36	47		93	28
ELL	18	36	33	17	19	23	36				
ASN	81	75					90				
BLK	23	32	26	18	10	8	23	53		86	58
HSP	45	32	22	33	25	18	62	64		100	67
MUL	73	65		59	57		83	65		94	56
WHT	59	51	30	46	39	31	70	82		96	63
FRL	42	43	29	35	28	23	52	71		91	57
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	32	31	17	33	33	50	57		86	13
ELL	30	39	42	45	38	18	43			75	
ASN	61	44		75	80		70				
BLK	28	39	50	34	36	38	63	40		71	33
HSP	42	28	20	33	29	8	47	67		86	46
MUL	55	41	17	33	34		63	36		88	57
WHT	59	46	45	51	49	36	69	78		88	67
FRL	51	39	33	39	39	26	61	66		80	48

**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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	635
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	63
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
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	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?**

English had a downturn in overall performance. The category with the highest number of students was Level 1 ELA-190/376.

Other categories (Math, Science, and Social Studies) had the highest percentage of students achieving level 3.

Economically disadvantaged students disproportionately fell into Level one in ELA and Math.

Students with disabilities were 2% under target on the ESSA Federal Index. All other categories were above target.

ELL students need to continue to be supported because they are still scoring below a passing level.

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

The greatest need improvement is within our students with disabilities.

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

Students with ELL Plans, IEPs, and 504 Plans need continued support to achieve greater growth. Self-Advocacy and remediation are key to improving their performance.

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

Math learning gains showed the most improvement year over year.

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

Increased access to tutoring (after school, Power Hour, weekend bootcamps).

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

Continuing focus on the Power Hour tutoring model and increasing student participation in the tutoring sessions.

**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.**

Teacher-2-Teacher planning period professional development sessions where highly quality share ideas and strategies for increased learning in the classroom.

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

Continued work in PLC groups with teachers in like content areas focusing on student growth that meet twice monthly. Continuing to monitor progress assessments and using the new tools available during this school year.

**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 Collaborative Planning**

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

In order to ensure students are exposed to a guaranteed and viable curriculum, teachers need time to collaborate and create common lessons and analyze common assessment data. Utilizing the PLC time to plan lessons and reflect on assessment data will help boost student achievement.

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

If teachers engage in quality professional development, collaborate, develop higher-order standards-based lessons that increase active engagement, then student learning gains will increase in reading, writing, and literacy across the disciplines. Our goal is to improve in the areas of proficiency and learning gains by at least 4 percentage points in ELA FSA and Math EOC scores and increase proficiency in Biology and U.S. History by focusing on developing a guaranteed and viable curriculum, sound lessons, and infusing literacy in all content areas.

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

Progress monitoring will occur through weekly PLC agendas/minutes, common assessment data, student grades, and the early warning system report.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Anji Dunlap (dunlaac@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Embed collaboration in PLC teams to plan standards based instruction, plan common lessons, analyze student work and common assessments, and reflect on teaching based on DuFour's "Learning by Doing."

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

Students need to be exposed to the same content regardless of the class in which they are enrolled. By teachers working collaboratively in PLC teams and utilizing the district created pacing guides as well as content standards, students should have access to a guaranteed and viable curriculum.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

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

**Person Responsible**

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



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

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

Due to Hurricane Michael and the COVID-19 pandemic, students have had 4 years of interrupted education. To close the gaps in student learning, we will implement Power Hour one day a week to allow students to obtain additional instructional time in an area they feel they are struggling.

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

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

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

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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

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

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

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

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

**Person Responsible**

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

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Skipping**

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

Skipping has been a major concern over the last year. In an effort to make skipping less desirable, we instituted a lunch detention directive. Students are assigned lunch detention, and therefore, they are not missing additional class time.

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

The school aims to reduce the number of referrals for skipping by 10%.

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

Use of schoolwide lunch detention spreadsheet will allow us to track the number of students assigned for skipping. Discipline referrals can also be tracked through focus.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Anji Dunlap (dunlaac@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

This form of alternative discipline strategy will allow us to avoid in school suspension whenever possible and office discipline referrals.

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

Keeping students in class instead of using in school suspension as the consequence will increase student time in the educational setting.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

Mr. Bell will facilitate the lunch detention data acquisition.

**Person Responsible**

Joseph Bell (belljz@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

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

n/a

**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

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

n/a

**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

**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

**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

**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

## **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.**

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

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

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

Efforts to communicate with parents, students, and community:

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