

Bay District Schools

New Horizons Learning Center



2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| R.A.I.S.E | 0 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 16 |

New Horizons Learning Center

3200 MINNESOTA AVE, Panama City, FL 32405

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gordon Pongratz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 2021-22 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Function (per accountability file) | ESE |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative 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* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Unsatisfactory 2016-17: Maintaining |
| DJJ Accountability Rating | 2023-24: No Rating |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

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

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at New Horizons Learning Center is to provide an exceptional special education program in a safe and positive-behavior supportive environment that meets that the unique learning needs of every student and partners with families as well as the community to foster students' academic, social, and emotional growth for success beyond graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become an exceptional special education school that empowers students to become successful in the classroom and community.

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

New Horizons is a center school, 100% ESE with various disabilities to include behavior, IND, learning disabilities, speech and language and OHI. (As of 8/1/22) Our student population is 113 with 23 (22%) females and 90 (78%) males to start off our year. We are 100% Free and Reduced lunch. We support our students and staff with small core classes and a para in each classroom.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Pongratz, Gordon | Principal | Initiate and facilitate PLC and team/faculty meetings based on the needs of the district, staff/students; serves as advisory member of content and grade group PLC teams; performs ongoing data collection and analysis to determine academic and behavior needs of our school; assists all teachers/paraprofessionals with professional development when needed. |
| Mitchell, Helen | Assistant Principal | Initiate and facilitates PLC and team meetings based on the needs of the district, staff/students; heads up the SIP team, works with teachers on gradebook, curriculum; reviews lesson plans weekly; serves as advisory member of content and grade group PLC teams; performs ongoing data collection and analysis to determine academic and behavior needs of our school; assists all teachers/paraprofessionals with professional development as needed. |
| Grady, Brittney | School Counselor | As a School Counselor, Brittney holds intake meetings for students on academic and behavior expectations; daily counseling and intervention, completes academic plans for each grade level; response team support and participation; and is our Title 1 school based coordinator. Brittney also heads up the Attendance PLC. |
| Nelson, Helen | School Counselor | As a School Counselor, Helen holds intake meetings for students on academic and behavior expectations; daily counseling and intervention, completes academic plans for each grade level; response team support and participation; and is our MTSS coordinator. |
| Hunter, Anita | Other | Anita is our IEP coordinator, working with teachers on writing IEPs, goal setting, and point sheets. She participates in all IEP parent meetings and manifestations working with teachers, parents, students and the district on strategies to help students be successful. New this year, Anita will serve as liaison between district ESE Department staff and school staff relating updated information on IEPs, participate in monthly ESE Team Leader meetings and continue to serve as the primary contact for school-based team members for all questions pertaining to developing compliant IEPs. |

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

n/a

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/10/2022, Gordon Pongratz

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

113

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

19

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

18

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

1

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

9

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

7

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

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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 | 13 | 19 | 27 | 16 | 20 | 16 | 11 | 122 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 15 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 77 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 11 | 16 | 9 | 5 | 89 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 24 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 18 | 21 | 22 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 92 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 18 | 21 | 22 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 92 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 12 | 21 | 15 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |

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 | 13 | 14 | 23 | 15 | 18 | 14 | 7 | 104 |

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 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 20 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/9/2022

2021-22 - 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 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 33 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 32 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 25 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 15 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 29 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 21 | 27 | 16 | 22 | 16 | 8 | 124 |

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 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 33 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 |

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 | | 52% | 51% | | | | | 57% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | | | | 49% | 51% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | 35% | 42% |
| Math Achievement | | 33% | 38% | | | | | 58% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | | | | 53% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | 50% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | 53% | 40% | | | | | 74% | 68% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | 56% | 48% | | | | | 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 | 12% | 56% | -44% | 54% | -42% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 7% | 54% | -47% | 52% | -45% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 59% | -59% | 56% | -56% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 6% | 53% | -47% | 55% | -49% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 3% | 59% | -56% | 54% | -51% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 7% | 48% | -41% | 46% | -39% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 51% | -51% | 48% | -48% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 71% | -71% | 67% | -67% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 4% | 74% | -70% | 71% | -67% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 74% | -74% | 70% | -70% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 64% | -64% | 61% | -61% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 62% | -62% | 57% | -57% |

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 | 13 | 35 | 62 | 12 | 46 | 73 | 18 | 22 | | | |
| BLK | 14 | 29 | | 20 | 17 | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 18 | 48 | | 12 | 58 | | | 27 | | | |
| FRL | 15 | 38 | 64 | 13 | 38 | | 18 | 26 | | | |
| 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 | 10 | 12 | 9 | 2 | 18 | | | | | 60 | |
| BLK | 21 | 13 | | | 18 | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 9 | 10 | | 5 | 24 | | | | | 70 | |
| FRL | 12 | 14 | 10 | 3 | 15 | | | | | | |
| 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 | 25 | 49 | 75 | 16 | 27 | 20 | 31 | 7 | | 74 | 5 |
| BLK | 25 | 36 | | 20 | 31 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 29 | 52 | | 19 | 34 | | 36 | 13 | | 71 | 7 |
| FRL | 20 | 43 | 70 | 13 | 21 | 20 | 26 | 4 | | 80 | 5 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 34 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 270 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 88% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 20 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 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 | 33 |
| 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 | 30 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

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

Academically, we trended down across the board from our 2021-2022 school year. Over the last three years, lack of attendance is trending up and behavior issues continue to be a barrier to student success. Based on 2021-2022 Discipline data there were 738 discipline referrals written which resulted in 277 days of Out of school suspension and 89 days of In-School Suspension. This significant loss of learning has negatively impacted our students' academic success.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We have to begin with improving our attendance and correcting behavior. Academically IXL and iReady are not reliable because many of our students refuse to test correctly or to take testing seriously. Utilizing our spring FSA scores, our ELA learning gains dropped from 2019 at 44% to 31%. ELA will continue to be our goal. We utilized IXL last year also for supplementing areas of need.

Our areas of need begin with attendance, then continuing to lower our discipline referrals so that we can get our academics back to the previous year at "MAINTAINING". Attendance and behavior must be our priorities. Academics will strengthen once these two areas are stronger.

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

Some of the contributing factors are that our population of students is very transient. We have students who enroll into our school during any time of the school year. Also, many exit for a 21 period when they are enrolled in DJJ. Since the population changes so often, sometimes consistency is hard to occur thus resulting in gains being dropped.

The new actions that we will address is working with DJJ teachers to ensure continuity of instruction, so when students return they will still be on track with their peers. This school year, we are going to a 7th period schedule, which aligns with the other schools in Bay District. This will also help with a consistent pattern for students who transfer into New Horizons.

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

Our math learning gains went from 28% in 2018-2019 to 40% in 2021-2022 school year. The use of i Ready and IXL will help continue the support that helped us make the learning gains.

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

We attribute this increase to the Intense Math class that was offered this past year. We placed students who had Level 1 and Level 2 scores on the FSA from the previous school year.

The use of i Ready and IXL for progress monitoring allowed for teachers to troubleshoot low areas in real time.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.

We will continue to offer credit recovery through Edgenuity for our students who failed classes to get them to their correct grade level. The District has also allowed us to open new credit through Edgenuity to all of our Science and History classes. In high school, we will continue using IXL and in middle school the district has us using i Ready in ELA and Math classes to support the core curriculum.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Utilizing the new B.E.S.T standards, we will increase the percent of students making learning gains in ELA.
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: To increase the percent of students making learning gains in ELA by 5%
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring: The district adopted our new ELA curriculum to match B.E.S.T. standards. We also have incorporated intensive reading classes and that teacher is supporting the ELA teachers.
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Helen Mitchell (mitchhe@bay.k12.fl.us)
 We are a unique school in that we only have a population of 120 students grades 6-12. Because we are so small, our PLCs are unique - Middle School PLC, High School PLC, Special Areas - Attendance PLC and Elective PLC. Data is discussed relating to attendance, behavior and then our academics. Our next PLC, for example, we will be looking at the student data from the iReady and IXL diagnostic tests. The ELA B.E.S.T standards are being addressed as whole group and then using iReady data in pull out sessions with the teachers.

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.
 1. Assessment data, to include iReady and IXL, FSA and EOC's, has shown a decline in student assessment performances for the past year.
 2. Integration of Knowledge and Ideas and Key Ideas are still the two sub-skills areas in which our students perform the weakest.
 3. Barrier include: attendance and behaviors. We will have an attendance PLC to include our school counselors, TRIAD, Graduation Coach and IEP Coordinator.

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

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

PLCs will devote time to discuss the ELA data for each of our students and the strategies to help our below grade level students as well as enrichment for our grade level and above grade level students. The attendance PLC will collaborate with administration to create incentives for students who attend school

regularly, who are in attendance during all progress monitoring and do their best, both behavior wise and academically.

Person Responsible

Helen Mitchell (mitchhe@bay.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

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

Our area of focus is for all subgroups because all of our students have an IEP. Our subgroups consist of 11 Hispanic/Latino, 43 Black/African American, 58 white, 21 females and 91 males. Of our 112 student population, 11 are special diploma and take the FSAA.

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Other

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

We have an attendance/behavior PLC that pulls attendance and behavior data bi-monthly. As they pull and update the data, they work on strategies to help our students, teachers and parents. Included in their data collection is looking at the Positive Behavior Plans (PBIPs) that every student at this school has to determine better strategies and goals to help our students

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

The attendance/behavior PLC (school counselors, TRIAD team, social worker, SLP, IEP coordinator, Grad Coach) communicates to the leadership team and teachers the trends they are seeing, strategies to help teachers work with students and parents in both areas as needed. and communicates to our in-house social worker and the districts' PRESENT team to help with the attendance by making home visits.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

TRIAD - helps with behavior and mental health issues. With regard to behavior, they work on skills to help prevent the behaviors in the future.
 School Counselors - help the students with preparing for the future, working with schedules, outside agencies, and working with parents to help families in and outside the school setting.
 Graduation Coach - assist school counselors in conducting checks for graduation requirements.
 Teachers/Paras - working in homeroom with social/emotional skills, conferencing with parents/students to share both successes and concerns.

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.

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| The attendance PLC will collaborate with administration to create incentives for teachers who take attendance on time as well as incentives for students who attend school. | Mitchell, Helen, mitchhe@bay.k12.fl.us |