Bay Point Middle School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bay Point Middle School

2151 62ND AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

http://www.baypoint-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Jason Shedrick J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2019

2018-19 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: C 2013-14: C
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A

ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](http://www.floridacims.org)

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The school mission for Bay Point Middle School is "Educate and prepare students for College, Career, and Life."

Provide the school's vision statement

The school vision for bay Point Middle School is "Success for Life."

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Peifley, Samantha	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Bennett, Dennard	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
McElveen, Lara	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	334	316	321	0	0	0	0	971
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	58	65	0	0	0	0	164
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	84	79	0	0	0	0	230
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	16	20	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	135	149	0	0	0	0	421

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	92	76	0	0	0	0	233

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	1	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
48

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 7/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	108	104	0	0	0	0	319
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	87	93	0	0	0	0	293
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	17	20	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	171	132	0	0	0	0	444

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	91	76	0	0	0	0	263

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	52%	54%	46%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	54%	49%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	47%	47%	40%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	45%	55%	58%	46%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	48%	52%	57%	50%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	51%	39%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	51%	51%	46%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	68%	72%	50%	65%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	334 (0)	316 (0)	321 (0)	971 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	41 ()	58 ()	65 ()	164 (0)
One or more suspensions	67 (0)	84 (0)	79 (0)	230 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	23 (0)	16 (0)	20 (0)	59 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	137 (0)	135 (0)	149 (0)	421 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
06	2019	44%	51%	-7%	54%	-10%
	2018	42%	49%	-7%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	37%	51%	-14%	52%	-15%
	2018	44%	48%	-4%	51%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	51%	55%	-4%	56%	-5%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	35%	44%	-9%	55%	-20%
	2018	36%	45%	-9%	52%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	60%	-11%	54%	-5%
	2018	51%	59%	-8%	54%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	19%	31%	-12%	46%	-27%
	2018	25%	31%	-6%	45%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	38%	51%	-13%	48%	-10%
	2018	47%	53%	-6%	50%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	58%	68%	-10%	71%	-13%
2018	52%	66%	-14%	71%	-19%
Compare		6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	82%	55%	27%	61%	21%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	75%	57%	18%	62%	13%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	56%	41%	57%	40%
2018	96%	56%	40%	56%	40%
Compare		1%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	38	33	17	37	35	23	17			
ELL	48	52		70	67						
ASN	85	66		94	80		90	100	95		
BLK	26	44	37	26	39	37	22	36	71		
HSP	57	59	67	60	54	50	41	63	88		
MUL	72	62		71	64		60	82	91		
WHT	75	62	80	80	63	77	75	85	87		
FRL	33	46	38	34	42	38	28	46	76		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	22	37	37	22	34	31	27	27			
ELL	40	53		47	56						
ASN	82	66		90	61		83		93		
BLK	27	40	41	26	41	35	23	35	52		
HSP	65	64	40	66	61		69	65	85		
MUL	60	51		50	49		56	55	50		
WHT	79	62	27	81	66	58	81	80	85		
FRL	36	45	41	37	45	39	37	39	62		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Science FSA showed the lowest performance with the highest drop in percentage from last year. I believe there is a gap in students retaining what is needed from the 6th and 7th grade years.

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

Science FSA showed the greatest decline in scores. The 50 plus students that took Physical Science Honors.....

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

Science had the greatest gap. Lack of retention from 6th and 7th grade.

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

The Social Studies showed the greatest gain. We moved the lower performing students were moved to history in order to give them time to prepare for Civics this year. A teacher schedule change was also made in order for students to get better instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance in all three grade levels and behavior issues resulting in inside and outside suspension.

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

1. Raise student achievement in science by 10%
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA/Reading
Rationale	Bay Point Middle School ELA overall achievement scores for the 2019 school year dropped from 46% to 44%. In reviewing the past data, there was a loss of two consistent ELA teachers during the 18-19 school year. Additionally, we have numerous students assigned to in school and out of school suspension resulting in lack of instructional momentum and time in classroom.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Bay Point will increase the overall achievement scores from 44% to 49%. Our overall goal is to meet or exceed district average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Bay Point Middle School will utilize common formative planning as result of common planning time with grade levels during the day. Additionally teachers will have two meetings monthly for professional learning communities. Administrative teams will meet with the teacher regularly both individually and within departments to review common formative assessment and drill on specific standards to increase student proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Use of proven practice with data driven decision making resources will be utilized at Bay Point. Data teams will meet regularly to assess student work, review lessons, and meet with teachers regularly to ensure that standards are being taught with fidelity and that student learning is being assessed daily as reviewed through informal and formal walk throughs.
Action Step	
Description	1. ELA teachers utilize a planning road map choose strategies and resources for use as they plan, to ensure high engagement, rigor and progress monitoring 2. Teachers intentionally design lessons on a trajectory of difficulty with multiple checkpoints to find out what students and then adapt instruction to meet students' needs. (Unit assessments, mini lessons, reviewing student work in the core connections. 3. Teachers will attend and implement professional development activities with core connections. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Samantha Peifley (peifleys@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math
Rationale	Bay Point MS had an overall achievement score of 45% as compared to the 18 school year with 46% overall score. This was a 1% drop in overall achievement score. District maintained overall achievement score from the 18 school year to the 19 school year.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Bay Point MS math goal is raise the overall achievement score from 45% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dennard Bennett (bennettd@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers utilize math unit assessments and use the assessments during unit planning and analyze the data by standard for their class and across the grade level. Administrators and math coach with teachers engage in math focused learning walks using district provided walk through tools. Conduct regular, monthly, PLC inclusive data chats to review students responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons incorporating MAFS and Practice Standards based on classroom and student level data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As a result of new teachers being hired for the 19-20 school year and the newly implemented math coach, Bay Point will restructure the professional learning communities and the use of common formative assessments which will drive instruction and allow opportunity for data chats with leadership.

Action Step	
Description	1. Utilize common planning and common formative (district cycle and unit) assessment with fidelity. 2. Foster a positive classroom environment with a focus on common language and positive behavior supports. 3. Provide on going feedback through progress monitoring with the assistance of leadership team. 4. Bay Point MS teachers need to continue to work on consistent lesson planning and implementation with fidelity. 5. Teachers will meet regularly and share best practices, outcomes on common formative assessment and share best practices.
Person Responsible	Dennard Bennett (bennettd@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science overall achievement
Rationale	Bay Point MS had an overall achievement score of 39%. This was drop from 46% the previous year.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Bay Point MS will increase the overall achievement score from 39% to 45% in the 19-20 school year as evidenced by the SSA proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lara McElveen (mcelveenl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen the overall instructional staff and assist with engaging in common language for teaching school wide and classroom expectations. Assist the overall instructional staff by providing professional development standards based curriculum. Assist the overall instructional staff by utilizing common formative assessment and data driven decision making to ensure all students are working towards and meeting standards utilizing differentiation in instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Concern with current staff not using district common formative assessment with fidelity. Additionally, lack of consistent and proven instructional practices.

Action Step	
Description	1. Conduct regular, monthly and PLC's to be inclusive of data chats with leadership team. 2. Regularly utilize and assess (formally and informally) data to modify and adjust instruction. Using district cycle and unit assessments. 3. Utilize assistance of the science coach to provide formal and informal feedback to include modeling of best practices. Provide professional development on standards based curriculum. Utilize common formative assessment and data driven decision making. Engage in common language for teaching school wide and classroom expectations. 4. Leadership team to conduct walk throughs and data chats to include opportunity for professional development and classroom observations during the day. 5. Use inquiry based learning using the 5 E Model of instruction.
Person Responsible	Lara McElveen (mcelveenl@pcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Social Studies- Civics
Rationale	Bay Point increased the overall achievement score from 50% to 56% in the 19 school year. We achieved this score by assessing instructional practice and making adjustments in the master schedule to ensure students were receiving appropriate and effective instruction.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Bay Point will seek to increase the overall achievement score of 56%to 61% for the 20 school year. We will do this by continuing to monitor teacher effectiveness and appropriate learning strategies and implemented with fidelity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Samantha Peifley (peifleys@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Continue to strengthen instructional staff by ensuring and supporting students in complex tasks. Continue to support staff in utilizing common formative assessment and data to drive the instructional focus of the lessons. We will utilize common planning and best instructional practices with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Bay Point will continue to increase student overall achievement to ensure students are meeting and exceeding the expectations of both the district and state as document through the Civics assessment.
Action Step	
Description	1. Utilize supplemental resources to include common formative assessment. 2. Create functioning professional learning communities to include shared common planning allowing for teach and reteach. 3. Complete on going formal and informal walk throughs with leadership team allowing for feedback and professional practice. 4. Create and instructional environment of professional growth allowing for demonstration classrooms. 5. Core connections PD to increase literacy in the content area of Social Studies.
Person Responsible	Samantha Peifley (peifleys@pcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Exceptional Student Education
Rationale	Bay Point MS ELA achievement had an overall score of 15% (level 3). In math, Bay Point had an overall achievement score was 17% (level 3).

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Instruction from the previous school year was self contained, therefore, students may of benefited from additional opportunity with inclusion in core academic subjects.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Samantha Peifley (peifleys@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students requiring ESE services will continue to work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while continuing working on foundation skills to engage in rigorous, grade level content. Additionally, students will be assessed for inclusion in core academic cores with support from ESE and behavior coaching.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	ESE students at Bay Point MS continue to lose instructional time in the classroom as a result of inconsistency with behavior and support plans. Additionally, teachers need additional assistance and support with accommodations and strategies to ensure all students learning needs are met.

Action Step	
Description	1. Ensure the master schedule is developed with the ESE students needs are being met first. 2. HIre and retain instructional ESE teachers with appropriate certification and skills to assist our students with varying exceptional. 3. Provide additional professional development with teaming co-teaching. 4. Provide additional training for providing accommodations and self advocacy. 5.
Person Responsible	Samantha Peifley (peifleys@pcsb.org)

#6	
Title	Bridge The Gap
Rationale	Raise student achievement within the African American population. We are currently at 38% overall achievement proficiency. An increase in number of in school as well as out of school suspensions, resulted in students missing critical instruction.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We want to increase to 50% overall achievement proficiency by keeping students in the classroom using positive incentives and modeling for teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lara McElveen (mcelveenl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize and implement common language for teaching expectations school wide and classroom management via CHAMPS which a proven program for behavior modifications. Additionally we are going to utilize and implement positive behavior intervention strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on last years discipline data. Bay Point had the highest in and out of school suspensions.
Action Step	
Description	1. Effectively recruit, hire and retain teachers. 2. Create an environment through the continuous improvement model for effective classroom management techniques while using equitable practices meeting individual student needs. 3. Create positive behavior intervention strategies with student needs in mind and allowing for teacher autonomy and Best Practices with fidelity. 4. Create and implement community and parental partnerships. 5. ELP before and after school to engage students in academics and providing additional enrichment opportunities.
Person Responsible	Lara McElveen (mcelveenl@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

N/A

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	**Areas of Focus: ELA/Reading**	$0.00
2	III.A	**Areas of Focus: Math**	$0.00
3	III.A	**Areas of Focus: Science overall achievement**	$0.00

4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Social Studies- Civics	$0.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: Exceptional Student Education	$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: Bridge The Gap	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00