

Bay District Schools

Mowat Middle 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	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Mowat Middle School

1903 W HIGHWAY 390, 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.

Mowat Middle School's mission is to create an engaging learning environment that inspires all students to reach their full academic potential and become socially responsible citizens and life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to educate the students of today for the demands of tomorrow.

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
Sheffield, Ed	Principal	
DeMoss, Maegan	Assistant Principal	
Rivers, Darnita	Assistant Principal	
Gillmore, Vickie	Assistant Principal	
Barlow, Byron	Teacher, K-12	
Birdwell, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Hicks, David	Teacher, K-12	
Hoffman, Donna	Teacher, K-12	
Miller, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	
Rivera, Chelarishi	Teacher, K-12	
Skipper, Jeff	Teacher, K-12	
Tant, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	
Terry, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	

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.

The SLT meets monthly to review the school improvement goals, address strategies relating to current data, and strategize solutions for potential problems. Additionally each teacher is also a department chair and member of a PLC and work to guide their PLCs as they weekly work on PLC goals, lesson plans, supporting the SIP and determining remediation and enrichment tasks for students. Data from annual climate surveys

ensure that all stakeholders have a voice in school improvement, as well as gathering feedback from school advisory council members.

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))

PLCs will look at progress monitoring data, common assessments and other data to ensure that students are making progress towards mastery of the standards. Data will be monitored and reviewed in MTSS meetings, ensuring that no students are left behind academically. The school leadership team will then meet to review and revise actions steps as needed, to ensure that progress is made towards closing the student achievement gap especially within our targeted subgroups.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	41%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	83	72	56	211	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	71	71	188	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	7	23	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	70	53	179	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	89	64	211	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	3	1	90	

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	68	73	56	197

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	5	1	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	5

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	58	51	53	162	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	28	60	119	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	16	27	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	57	87	224	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	70	86	266	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	4	0	96	

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	61	36	62	159

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	4	5	5	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	18	36

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	58	51	53	162	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	28	60	119	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	16	27	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	57	87	224	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	70	86	266	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	4	0	96	

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	61	36	62	159

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	4	5	5	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	18	36

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	50	49	49	53	50	52		
ELA Learning Gains				48			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			44		
Math Achievement*	60	60	56	48	41	36	50		
Math Learning Gains				54			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			42		
Science Achievement*	47	52	49	46	57	53	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	71	68	77	60	58	77		
Middle School Acceleration	57	64	73	61	53	49	71		
Graduation Rate					50	49			
College and Career Acceleration					77	70			
ELP Progress	33	42	40	36	63	76	40		

** 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	322
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	507
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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	34	Yes	2	
ELL	33	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	41			
HSP	45			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	46			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	39	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	54			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	44			

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			60			47	77	57			33
SWD	21			31			12	57	50		5	
ELL	18			28				53			4	33
AMI												
ASN	67			75							2	
BLK	31			30			24	69	50		5	
HSP	41			49			35	60	50		6	33
MUL	47			59			26	68	60		5	
PAC												
WHT	54			70			56	82	60		5	
FRL	38			46			37	64	43		5	

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	49	48	37	48	54	51	46	77	61			36
SWD	20	38	34	26	49	44	27	40				
ELL	24	46	40	24	48	55						36
AMI												
ASN	61	56		78	72							
BLK	25	35	29	20	39	40	19	55				
HSP	49	53	42	49	62	57	64	68	58			38
MUL	50	57	67	42	48	73	42	71				
PAC												
WHT	56	49	36	56	56	55	51	84	60			
FRL	39	44	35	35	47	49	30	71	43			

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	52	49	44	50	41	42	52	77	71			40
SWD	21	39	36	21	29	28	21	63				
ELL	24	36		19	21							40
AMI												
ASN	81	81		81	50							
BLK	24	37	33	17	31	33	26	51				
HSP	53	44	47	45	37	27	47	81	50			
MUL	57	47	50	39	42	38	36	67				
PAC												
WHT	57	51	47	58	43	49	58	85	74			
FRL	42	43	40	38	39	41	41	68	66			

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
07	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	47%	1%
08	2023 - Spring	44%	48%	-4%	47%	-3%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	46%	-1%	47%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	54%	55%	-1%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	50%	53%	-3%	48%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	61%	5%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	51%	-6%	44%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	57%	31%	50%	38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	50%	46%	48%	48%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	71%	3%	66%	8%

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.

Our intended outcome for the 2023-2024 school year would be to increase learning gains by 10% within the lowest quartile, in the area of reading and ELA, while focusing on our African American, ELL and Students with Disabilities as our targeted lowest subgroup according to our 2023-2024 EWS data. We believe that the lack of foundational skills due to interrupted learning as well as other circumstances may be contributing to declined reading scores, which also affects the science state assessment. As of the 2023-24 school year, our 6th and 7th graders ended the year staying in line with state scores at 46% (6th Grade) testing on grade level for reading and 47% (7th Grade) testing on grade level. However, 8th graders fell below the state average by three points and the district average by 4 points, at 44% testing on grade level. In turn, we believe the lack of foundational English language skills, as well as reading comprehension, affects the science scores as it is mainly informational and scientific text. Our 2022-23 score for the science assessment was at 45% testing on grade level, compared to the state average of 44% and the district average of 51%. We are looking to increase that number for the 2022-23 school year, as well.

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

As of the 2022-23 school year, ELA and Science are currently showing the greatest need for improvement, with Science achievement at 21 points below the state average and ELA learning gains at 2 points below the state average. However, this year shows that the science score is in line with the state average of on grade level students, the FAST data from this past school year, at 45%.

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.

There are several factors that play in to the need for improvement, with one being the continued learning recovery from Hurricane Michael and the most recent pandemic. Last year, our school unfortunately our school was unable to fill several positions, leading to the buyout of multiple planning periods. However, this was an improvement over the 9 positions that could not be filled in the 2021-22 school year, leading to Edgenuity being the online curriculum that was used to teach and master standards.

For some teachers, this was a new curriculum and for students, this was also a challenge but was the only way for students to still receive on grade level content. In addition, there has been a huge demographic shift and influx of new students, with many ELL students enrolling often.

As a result, we will have to double down on making sure our ELL students get the foundational skills needed to navigate the ELA and Science curriculum, as well as making sure our lowest quartile is also getting special attention. We will need to rely on our district resources, progress monitoring and common assessments to make sure that we are headed in the right direction.

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

Math learning gains showed an improvement of 2 percentage points, from 2019 state assessment data. In addition, Social Studies continues to be well above the state (26 percentage points) and the district (5 percentage points).

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

Based on our EWS data, students with 10% or more days of absences and one or more suspensions are two potential areas of concern. We believe that this contributes to the learning gaps we are seeing in the area of reading.

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

- Increasing learning gains in ELA specifically with our African American students, ELL students and students with disabilities.
- Student discipline incorporating a more streamlined and structured approach to PBIS.
- Parental involvement and engagement.

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.

Our EWS data for the 2022-23 school year shows that our students with one or more suspensions was 119. In reviewing our discipline data, the highest listed infractions were inappropriate behavior/ language, disruption classroom, and defiance/ insubordination. African American students, English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities are among students with higher discipline and have shown lower performance on mastering the standards and learning gains by our state assessment data. We believe there is a correlation between the increased number of discipline referrals and the decline in reading proficiency, in all subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-24 school year, our goal is to decrease the number of discipline referrals by 10% in the areas of innappropriate behavior/ language, disruption of classroom, and defiance/ insubordination using the implementation of PBIS and school-wide behavior expectations.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus via our monthly discipline data review, PBIS and PLC team meetings to include data chats. In addition, individual student data will be monitored and discussed in our MTSS-B meetings and shared with our SLT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darnita Rivers (riverda@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.)

PBIS is a research-based program that has shown to improve school cultures and provide interventions that can lead to a reduction in discipline referrals if implemented with fidelity. PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention & Support) will be comprised of a token system along with a monthly incentive to promote a positive school culture. Students will be taught school-wide expectations for behavior and will be rewarded for demonstrating those expectations. MTSS-B will be utilized to provide a sucessful approach to multi tiered interventions to respond to student behaviors and will be part of our addressing our African-American students, English Language Learners, and ESE..

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

EWS and school-wide discipline data provide the rationale for use of this evidence-based intervention. PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support) is evidence based and will aid us in support of our students' needs, both behavioral and emotional. .

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.

Development of School-wide Expectations and classroom expectations

Character Lessons with Expectations during Critical Thinking class

School-Wide Events and Golden Tickets

Wellness/ TRIAD team to provide services to students

Mentors for students by Elevate Bay and Mentorship grant

Implementation of MTSS-B

Person Responsible: Darnita Rivers (riverda@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: The implementation will occur throughout the 2023-24 school year beginning in September and ending in May.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Our intended outcome for the 2023-2024 school year would be to increase learning gains by 10% within the lowest quartile, in the area of reading and ELA, while focusing on our 128 African American, 70 ELL and 155 Students with Disabilities as our targeted lowest subgroup according to our 2023-2024 EWS data. We believe that the lack of foundational skills due to interrupted learning as well as other circumstances may be contributing to declined reading scores, which also affects the science state assessment. As of the 2023-24 school year, our 6th and 7th graders ended the year staying in line with state scores at 46% (6th Grade) testing on grade level for reading and 47% (7th Grade) testing on grade level. However, 8th graders fell below the state average by three points and the district average by 4 points, at 44% testing on grade level. In turn, we believe the lack of foundational English language skills, as well as reading comprehension, affects the science scores as it is mainly informational and scientific text.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The primary goal is to raise the overall average reading scores. We will attempt to raise the average reading score of the three targeted sub-groups to 41 or higher;

Monitoring:

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

School Based Leadership team will meet and go over student data, after PLCs have met. In addition, we will be taking a more focused approach with these subgroups in our MTSS meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maegan DeMoss (demosml@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.)

We will be using our MTSS Academic system to monitor effectiveness and utilize our interventionist to target the our struggling learners in these subgroups. We will also use the EWS to monitor students as we meet in our MTSS meetings, as well as PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This rationale is based on the data provided through the EWS and based on state assessment data over the last several years.

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.

- Scheduling of intensive classes as reflected in Master Schedule
- During PLCs grade level teams will analyze student data (i.e. common assessments, IREADY, and FAST) and discuss curriculum challenges and modifications
- Classroom Walk-throughs
- Implementation of Learning Lab to assist students academically
- Push in/ pull out for ESE and ELL classes
- MTSS academic and behavior chats including our Interventionist Jennifer Beach and Dr. Kimberly Leath, our MTSS-B Staff Training Specialist
- Implementation of learning lab to assist students academically in all content areas.

Person Responsible: Maegan DeMoss (demosml@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Action steps will be embedded throughout the school year.

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).

Our school plans to improve the placement of our lowest learners in remediation classes that will help students improve their reading levels and comprehension. In addition, the school plans to continue a whole child approach by ensuring that our students needs are met academically and emotionally by implementing the services of our wellness team. Student who are chronically absent or are struggling with discipline will also be given the opportunity to be involved in our life skills groups. Our hope is that implementing these resources intentionally will ensure that all students on our campus are able achieve academically.