

Bay District Schools

A. Crawford Mosley High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

A. Crawford Mosley High School

501 MOSLEY DR, Lynn Haven, FL 32444

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To be a safe school that provides a diverse student body with the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in an increasingly complex and technological society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A national LEADER in education where every student will be successful.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bullock, Brian	Principal	Oversee day-to-day operations of the school, serve as an instructional leader, manage school logistics and budgets, monitor student growth and performance, adjust supports and services based on student needs, monitor teacher performance and provide guidance and support, ensure that the campus is safe and secure, build productive relationships with families, community members and other stakeholders
Evans, Katrina	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in the overall administration of the school and assumes leadership of the school in the absence of the principal, serves as an Instructional Leader; facilitates the work of PLCs, leads data driven discussions and planning, relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy
Page, Kristi	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in the overall administration of the school and assumes leadership of the school in the absence of the principal, serves as an Instructional Leader; facilitates the work of PLCs, leads data driven discussions and planning, relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy
Harless, Jodi	Teacher, K-12	Oversee the ELA Department: Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Whitfield, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	Oversee the Math Department: Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Chisholm, Kelly	Teacher, ESE	Oversee the ESE Department, Work collaboratively with all teachers to ensure that student IEPs are being implemented effectively. Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Hair, Patrick	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Oversee the Career/Technical Educational Department: Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Barron, Greg	Teacher, K-12	Oversee the Social Studies Department: Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Walsh, Lois	Teacher, K-12	Oversee the Science Department: Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Williams, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Oversee the Foreign Language Department: Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School leadership team reviews SIP goals and provides feedback as to strategies to implement to best meet those goals. School Advisory Council reviews SIP and provides feedback as well.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Progress monitoring will take place to throughout the year as PLCs and the leadership team meet to review achievement data and common assessment data. Common assessments will be created and aligned to Florida's BEST Standards. Specific subgroup data will be reviewed to determine trends and growth among all subgroups, with extra focus on the lower performing subgroups (SWD and ELL). Upon review of the data, instructional adjustments will be made to continue to move toward meeting the goals outlined in the SIP.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	26%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	35%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	52	50	54	52	51	55		
ELA Learning Gains				49			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			34		
Math Achievement*	39	49	38	47	33	38	52		
Math Learning Gains				49			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			50		
Science Achievement*	69	69	64	66	53	40	72		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	71	66	75	56	48	72		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	94	88	89	96	64	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	72	64	65	70	70	67	78		
ELP Progress		47	45						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	579
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	96

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	4	
ELL	18	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	52			
HSP	62			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	58			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	20	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	47			
HSP	56			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	48			39			69	75		94	72	
SWD	18			12			22	45		48	6	
ELL	18			17							2	
AMI												
ASN	87							70			2	
BLK	31			23			53	51		59	6	
HSP	39			29			72	69		75	6	
MUL	54			56			66	76		75	6	
PAC												
WHT	50			41			69	78		73	6	
FRL	37			29			60	65		63	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	54	49	34	47	49	39	66	75		96	70	
SWD	15	33	29	18	35	26	22	37		98	25	
ELL	9						30					
AMI												
ASN	78	53					77	84				

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	37	43	21	33	38	29	38	76		100	50	
HSP	46	44	36	42	52		58	81		94	53	
MUL	55	43	23	52	63		71	74		93	63	
PAC												
WHT	56	51	36	50	49	43	69	74		95	74	
FRL	40	43	31	38	39	31	50	71		92	53	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	55	44	34	52	37	50	72	72		95	78	
SWD	22	29	26	23	30	33	29	37		93	41	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	87	74										
BLK	46	41	25	43	37	25	55	34		96	48	
HSP	60	48	33	52	22		78	75		100	86	
MUL	56	43		53	50		69	93		95	79	
PAC												
WHT	55	43	37	53	37	52	73	74		94	82	
FRL	40	35	33	46	39	43	57	62		89	64	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	50%	-2%
09	2023 - Spring	50%	46%	4%	48%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	41%	57%	-16%	50%	-9%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	50%	-8%	48%	-6%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	61%	8%	63%	6%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	61%	14%	63%	12%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that appeared to show the lowest performance was students showing proficient in ELA, with a decrease of 5 percentage points from 54% proficient to 49% proficient. One of the contributing factors would be the use of a blended curriculum for level 1 and 2 students. This curriculum model proved difficult for students to engage with. The data for the last two years have shown that this is not working. This year, there has been a shift in curriculum (CommonLit360), with a move towards a diagnostic assessment and very focused lessons in response to the assessment, specifically within the subgroup of the lowest 25%. In addition to this, other contributing factors are the second year with a new curriculum, a new progress monitoring assessment, and a large amount of new teachers.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is students scoring proficient on the GEOMETRY EOC. We believe the factors that contributed to this decline were the new test, new textbooks, and new teachers. Our plan will be to provide more experienced teachers, as well as after having a year with the new curriculum, teachers will be more comfortable with the content delivery.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Again, the greatest gap was Geometry. The state average was 49% showing proficient and our school had only 43%. We believe the factors that contributed to this decline were the new test, new textbooks, and new teachers. Our plan will be to provide more experienced teachers, as well as after having a year with the new curriculum, teachers will be more comfortable with the content delivery.

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

The largest improvement was shown in students showing proficient on the Algebra I EOC, with an increase from 39% proficient to 47% proficient. One new action that we believe aided in this growth was the implementation of a school-wide intervention time called "First I Need..." or "FIN Time." This intervention time was incorporated into the school day to provide teachers with the opportunity to work with students to target weak areas and provide individualized and focused support. Teachers reviewed the assessment data and scheduled students to come to FIN Time. Many of our teachers utilized this time to focus on closing learning gaps and providing additional supports.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Based on our school EWS data, attendance is an area of concern, with 37% of our students missing 10% or more of the school year. We will focus on increasing attendance as well as decreasing skipping incidents on campus.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Our highest priorities are:

1. Increasing the number of students scoring proficient in Reading as measured by the F.A.S.T. ELA assessment for our 9th and 10th graders.
2. Increase the number of students scoring proficient in Geometry.
3. Increase the number of students scoring proficient in our SWD and ELL subgroups, according to ESSA.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the area of positive culture and environment, we want to decrease the number of discipline referrals resulting in out-of-school suspension, which will also result in a decrease of lost instructional time.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2022-23 school year, there were 137 discipline referrals resulting in out-of-school suspension. We expect to see a 10% decrease in the number of discipline referrals resulting in out-of-school suspension.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data will be reviewed at various times throughout the year by the administrative PLC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristi Page (pagekn@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention being utilized in this area will be a proactive and restorative approach to discipline. Counseling, triad support, and in-school suspension will be used whenever possible instead of exclusionary discipline practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for this specific strategy is that the goal is to change behavior. Many studies have shown that exclusionary discipline does not change behavior and sometimes can cause more behavioral issues due to the loss of instructional time. Providing restorative opportunities allow for students to make their wrongs right and learn from them as they move forward, hopefully decreasing the need for out-of-school suspensions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Monthly Discipline Data Review - CARES Team meeting/TAT Meeting

Person Responsible: Kristi Page (pagekn@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When:

#2. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The Mosley teachers and administration will fully participate in Professional Learning Communities. While focusing on an increase in achievement for ALL students, PLCs will place an additional focus on the students within the Students with Disabilities and the English Language Learner subgroups. These students are performing below 40% based on the 21-22 ESSA information.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of Mosley teachers and administrators will be active participants in a Professional Learning Community and actively engage at least once weekly with the PLC. During these meetings, teachers and administrators will be intentional with reviewing student assessment data, with an increased emphasis on SWD and ELL subgroups.

Monitoring:

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

Each administrator is assigned a specific department and will be responsible for attending and monitoring the PLC activities within each department. Administrators will ensure that team members are contributing and actively monitoring student achievement data and planning for instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Bullock (bullobe@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The implementation of Professional Learning Communities will be used to examine student data, monitor for standards mastery, and plan for instruction to include intervention and enrichment. Professional Learning Communities provide teachers with professional development as they plan, learn, and grow from each other. With a focus on the SWD and ELL subgroups, PLCs will provide teachers the opportunities to learn, implement, and monitor effective instructional strategies for these subgroups as well.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is strong evidence nationwide that the effective implementation of Professional Learning Communities can greatly increase student achievement. When teachers are working together, engaged in data-driven, standards-based instructional planning and progress monitoring, instruction improves. Furthermore, when teachers are reflecting upon teaching practices and learning from each other, everyone's instruction improves, thus increasing student achievement. The PLC provides opportunities for teachers to review student outcomes, focusing on specific subgroups that are in need of additional support (SWD/ELL).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Creation of PLC agenda/minutes document to be used by all PLCs as a means of documenting the work of the PLC

Person Responsible: Brian Bullock (bullobe@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: 1st day of School - August 10, 2023

Provide PLC expectations to Staff

Person Responsible: Brian Bullock (bullobe@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

Reach out to Math/ELA district staff to support teachers i

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

In Bay District, we are a collaborative team. Together, the district office supports school leaders and staff members in developing spending plans that are directly aligned with their SIP goals. With the leadership of our Director of Federal Programs, the district monitors expenses bi-weekly and updates the financial spreadsheet. In an effort to be transparent, this spreadsheet is shared with stakeholders including district leaders, school leaders, and pertinent school staff members. In the event there is a need to update or modify the plan based on a change in need, then the group collaborates to develop an amendment.