Bay District Schools

J.R. Arnold High School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

J.R. Arnold High School

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

[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.

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, 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
Dunlap, Anji	Dean	Supervisor of implementation of SIP. Continuous review for mid-year reflection
Flaig, Donka	School Counselor	Monitoring of ELL students
Bell, Joseph	Teacher, Career/Technical	Technical advisor and data report generator
Bauer, Chris	Teacher, K-12	Science
Goss, Brandi	Teacher, K-12	Art, CTE, Clubs
Green, Sean	Teacher, K-12	Math
Carpenter, Susan	Teacher, K-12	ELA
Johnson, Julie	Teacher, K-12	ELA
Adley, Maria	Teacher, ESE	Social Studies and ESE
Smith, Britt	Principal	Overall Supervisor of SIP

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.

We used the input given by parents, students, and community members during our Student Advisory Council meetings. We used the data that was shared at our yearly faculty inservice days. We extensively used data from our Climate surveys, which have data gathered from staff, students, and parents connected to our school. We also used the input from local business owners who collaborated with Arnold at Arnold's job fair.

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))

The SIP will be monitored and revised as needed using the results and reflections from individual staff's DPs (Deliberate Practice plans) which will be discussed during PLC groups. PLC minutes will be used. All DP goals will incorporate the goals set by the SIP. Also, both early feedback taken from the state progress monitoring assessment data (FAST) based on the state standards (BEST) and lunch detention data will be used to monitor and revise the plan as needed.

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	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	36%
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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	399
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	371
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	51	52	50	53	52	51	56		
ELA Learning Gains				48			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			29		
Math Achievement*	39	49	38	49	33	38	42		
Math Learning Gains				54			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			24		
Science Achievement*	72	69	64	64	53	40	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	71	66	71	56	48	77		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	92	88	89	96	64	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	66	64	65	65	70	67	63		
ELP Progress	39	47	45	60			59		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	635
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	48			
HSP	56			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	67			

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%
FRL	57			

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	39	Yes	2	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	43			
HSP	57			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	52			

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	51			39			72	64		92	66	39
SWD	23			20			41	37		27	6	
ELL	29			29			46	38		42	7	39
AMI												
ASN	50			60						45	4	
BLK	34			22			59	47		42	6	
HSP	44			44			69	67		50	7	30
MUL	56			52			69	68		62	6	

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
PAC												
WHT	54			39			74	66		72	6	
FRL	42			35			65	55		68	7	44

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	53	48	31	49	54	44	64	71		96	65	60
SWD	20	27	21	30	46	48	41	29		88	43	
ELL	32	40	40	35	58	55	58	47		100	38	60
AMI												
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	56
MUL	58	48		48	47		53	84		91	81	
PAC												
WHT	57	49	27	51	54	46	67	73		95	67	
FRL	40	42	31	42	52	50	57	65		92	51	

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	56	49	29	42	36	24	67	77		96	63	59
SWD	23	36	27	25	31	26	36	47		93	28	
ELL	18	36	33	17	19	23	36					59
AMI												
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	57
MUL	73	65		59	57		83	65		94	56	
PAC												
WHT	59	51	30	46	39	31	70	82		96	63	
FRL	42	43	29	35	28	23	52	71		91	57	

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	50%	48%	2%	50%	0%
09	2023 - Spring	49%	46%	3%	48%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	32%	57%	-25%	50%	-18%

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	68%	61%	7%	63%	5%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	61%	2%	63%	0%

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.

We are under one warning category, students with disabilities. That data points to about 15% of our current student population. We are 2% under the federal goal. Historically, these students have shown a consistently low performance, due to lack of foundational skills. Environmental factors, such a recent hurricane and Covid, leading to less instructional time have severely impacted this group that already struggles with retaining foundational material presented in earlier grades.

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

ELA Lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from 2019 to 2022. Our achievement dropped from 38% to 31%. One factor that may have influenced this decline was the influx of more ELL students into the school. Our ELL students increased 22% over the 3 years.

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.

ELA Lowest 25% showed the greatest gap vs the state. State avg was 41% and our avg was 31%. Factors may have been due to lack of foundational skills during the formative years when students were experiencing online school due to Hurricane Michael and Covid.

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

Biology showed the most improvement. The entire science department used Study Island and had an increased focus on earning the ability to retest using assignments that prepared students to increase their scores.

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

N/A

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

1. ELA Lowest 25% specific to:
1. Students with Disabilities
2. ELL Students
3. Economically Disadvantaged Students

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 Other

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.

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. SWD are one of the main groups that we have found not attending class. This is due to avoidance of tasks and no confidence in learning the materials. Promotion of the importance of going to class while in lunch detention will hopefully increase attendance.

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.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anji Dunlap (dunlaac@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.)

This alternative discipline strategy, lunch detention, will allow us to avoid in- school suspension whenever possible and office discipline referrals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

Mr. Bell will facilitate the lunch detention data acquisition.
Quarterly Discipline data reports to verify strategy is working. (Anji Dunlap)

Person Responsible: Joseph Bell (belljz@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly and End of School Year

#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.

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 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.)

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 Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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.

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.

5. All teachers with focus on SWD within their Deliberate Practice

Person Responsible: Britt Smith (smithjb@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, Quarterly and Yearly

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

SWD has been below the 41% success rate for two consecutive years. It is an area of concern based on the data provided by the state.

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

Increase of SWD state progress monitoring assessment scores by 5%.

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

Monitored through state Progress Monitoring (FAST and BEST) testing. Quarterly data analysis to observe trends in improvement for SWD. Teachers, staff, and admin will be maintaining a mentorship log detailing contact and support provided to indicated students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

All faculty and staff will utilize ESE/504 plans and review prior test scores to establish mentoring. Each faculty member will be required to actively work with 5 or more students. Teachers will identify students in need via their class rosters. PLC groups will discuss strategies and remediations during regular meetings. General mentorship log will be utilized by all faculty.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will offer a more hands on and personal approach to engage students. Teachers will take an active role in assessments, daily life and positive impacts of each student assigned to them.

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.

1. Prepare of list of all SWD students with Level 1 or 2 test scores.
2. SIP members will discuss with faculty the importance of improving our only failing subgroup, as we have missed this target for two consecutive years.
2. Share list with teachers asking for volunteers/mentors. This will be done through established PLC groups on campus.
3. Create Google Sheet with all teachers/faculty listed for notes related to student interactions. Each PLC group will discuss how to use this sheet correctly to record notes.

4. Bi-weekly review of Google Sheet by admin to assess strategies being implemented

5. All teachers with focus on these students within their Deliberate Practice

Person Responsible: Anji Dunlap (dunlaac@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Bi-weekly review Quarterly assessment of strategies used to reestablish student needs Monitoring will continue weekly by Anji Dunlap. Spreadsheet will be shared bi-weekly to get an update from mentors.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

ELL students on our campus have historically underperformed on state assessments.

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

Increase of ELL state progress monitoring assessment scores by 5%.

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

Monitored through state Progress Monitoring (FAST and BEST) testing. Quarterly data analysis to observe trends in improvement for ELL. Teachers, staff, and admin will be maintaining a mentorship log detailing contact and support provided to indicated students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

All faculty and staff will utilize ELL plans and review prior test scores to establish mentoring. Each faculty member will be required to actively work with 5 or more students. Teachers will identify students in need via their class rosters. PLC groups will discuss strategies and remediations during regular meetings. General mentorship log will be utilized by all faculty.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will offer a more hands on and personal approach to engage students. Teachers will take an active role in assessments, daily life and positive impacts of each student assigned to them.

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.

1. Prepare of list of all ELL students with Level 1 or 2 test scores.
2. Share list with teachers asking for volunteers/mentors. This will be done through established PLC groups on campus.
3. Create Google Sheet with all teachers/faculty listed for notes related to student interactions. Each PLC group will discuss how to use this sheet correctly to record notes.
4. Bi-weekly review of Google Sheet by admin to assess strategies being implemented
5. All teachers with focus on these students within their Deliberate Practice

Person Responsible: Anji Dunlap (dunlaac@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: By the week of Sept. 18th all PLC groups will have introduced sheet to be used by faculty. Monitoring will continue weekly by Anji Dunlap. Spreadsheet will be shared bi-weekly to get an update from mentors.

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.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

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

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §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?

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

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

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

n/a

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

n/a

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

n/a

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

n/a

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

n/a

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

n/a

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

n/a

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No