Bayside High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bayside High School

1901 DEGROODT RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

http://www.bayside.brevard.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Holli Zander A

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2019

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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 Brevard 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.

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.

Table of Contents

Bayside High School

1901 DEGROODT RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

http://www.bayside.brevard.k12.fl.us/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	C	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

Bayside High School fosters within our students the academic passion, purpose, and perseverance (The Grit!) to be successful in the college and/or career of their choosing. (Revised: 2013-2014 school year)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bayside High School uses collaboration, reflections, and instructional technology as essential tools, preparing all students to excel in the workforce or post-secondary education. Moreover, faculty and staff stress the importance of integrity through modeling and reinforcing high character standards. (Revised: 2013-2014 school year)

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Zander, Holli	Principal	Oversees the running of the administrative teams and their individual objectives. Assesses teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth.
Feronti, Lauren	Dean	Monitors and influences student behaviors throughout the school in her role as dean. Oversees the New Teacher Mentoring Academy. Assesses teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth.
Setterbo, Kate	Dean	Monitors and influences student behaviors throughout the school in her role as dean. Assesses teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth.
Rubick, Gregory	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader monitoring and positively influencing curriculum and instruction. Oversees state and national testing throughout the school year. Guides the school counselor team in meeting focusing on student issues and graduation. Assesses teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth.
Small, John	Assistant Principal	Leads and organizes facility-based needs and the teams that address them. Assesses teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth.

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	0	0	0	421	483	416	327	1647
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	43	45	20	251
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	79	53	32	244
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	176	98	64	404
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	174	96	27	448

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	0	0	0	135	136	79	34	384

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	31	34	33	122
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	10	8	44

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/16/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	54%	59%	56%	55%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	52%	51%	46%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	40%	42%	37%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	45%	48%	51%	45%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	49%	48%	34%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	45%	45%	31%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	66%	66%	68%	64%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	70%	73%	61%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	421 (0)	483 (0)	416 (0)	327 (0)	1647 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	143 ()	43 ()	45 ()	20 ()	251 (0)
One or more suspensions	80 (0)	79 (0)	53 (0)	32 (0)	244 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	66 (0)	176 (0)	98 (0)	64 (0)	404 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	151 (0)	174 (0)	96 (0)	27 (0)	448 (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
09	2019	54%	62%	-8%	55%	-1%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	54%	59%	-5%	53%	1%
	2018	51%	61%	-10%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	66%	-2%	67%	-3%
2018	65%	67%	-2%	65%	0%
Compare		-1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	71%	-12%	70%	-11%
2018	64%	70%	-6%	68%	-4%
Compare		-5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	61%	-31%	61%	-31%
2018	30%	62%	-32%	62%	-32%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	60%	-7%	57%	-4%
2018	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%
Compare		7%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	31	32	22	34	22	45	41		68	54
ELL	17	31	26	17	42	50	20	20		73	45
BLK	35	54	43	33	43	36	49	41		85	68
HSP	50	44	35	38	44	40	58	61		88	73
MUL	48	50	43	29	23		41	67		87	85
WHT	63	49	33	56	50	31	78	67		83	76
FRL	46	46	34	39	42	34	62	54		81	73
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	44	41	16	28	24	26	42		74	51
ELL	24	53		10	38	40				63	60
BLK	40	48	36	27	35	33	46	53		86	59
HSP	54	61	54	39	42	55	62	63		79	67
MUL	50	42	31	45	41		72	76		83	55
WHT	61	57	51	51	45	27	77	69		88	70
FRL	50	52	44	40	39	31	63	60		83	64
2017 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	13	27	28	23	27	18	30	29		63	30
ELL	14	25	27	36						67	
BLK	44	38	24	34	26	20	52	43		83	59
HSP	50	48	43	48	34	28	62	55		82	69
MUL	53	44		46	36		52	71		92	71
WHT	62	50	45	48	37	39	70	70		83	71
FRL	49	43	34	41	33	31	62	53		79	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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The lowest-performing data component in 2019 was our mathematics lowest 25th percentile at a 34% achievement level, which is a 2% decrease in the prior year's performance, 2018. As a mitigating factor, this drop in achievement scores happened despite large gains in many sub-groups; ELL performance increased from 40% to 50%; Black Student performance increased from 33% to 36%; White students increased from 27% to 31%; and finally, FRL increased from 31% to 34%. Some of the disparity can be attributed to our achievement levels with the sub-group of Hispanic students. In 2018, 55% of our Hispanic students achieved proficient or better in mathematics, however, only 40% of our students achieved proficient in 2019. This is a concerning reduction in performance and is a contributing factor to our loss in overall mathematics achievement. A strong contributing factor to the decrease in the performance for all members of our lowest 25th percentile was the dissolution of our BEST program, which was an academic intervention for our lowest 25th percentile and focused resources on their performance. Secondarily, we also switched from an ALG 1A/1B model and embraced an ALG 1 only model. During the transition, students will be receiving less support in

fundamental mathematics before their initial mathematics test; however, this does allow students to receive an additional testing year during high school.

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

Our ELA Lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline from the previous year. In 2018, our Lowest 25th percentile had a 46% achievement rate which was higher than the state average. However, in 2019, our ELA Lowest 25th Percentile dropped to 37%, 5% below the state average. More specifically, in the ELA Lowest 25th percentile sub-group data, our Lowest 25th percentile White sub-group of students, along with Hispanic students show a stark decrease in achievement. In 2018, 51% of our White sub-group in the Lowest 25th percentile achieved proficient scores. But, in 2019 our average dropped to 33%. Similarly, our Hispanic Lowest 25th percentile reported a 54% scoring average in 2018, dropping to 35% in 2019. One contributing factor was the dissolution of our BEST program, which was an academic intervention for our lowest 25th percentile and focused resources on their performance. Students instead went un-cohorted and did not receive the same targeted supports that had been given in the past.

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.

With a 13% achievement gap, our Social Studies achievement scores show the largest gap between school and state average. On our campus last year we did not test 42 Advanced Placement United States History students which accounts for 10% of the 2021 Cohort. Additionally, within the same classroom, the students went through a teacher transition in the middle of the third nine weeks. One of our teachers left the school at which time the position was filled with a short-term substitute teacher for a period of time before another certified teacher was in the classroom. These factors had an effect on all of our subgroups, as there were decreases in achievement scores in each of the reported subgroups. It must also be mentioned that this cohort also had a 6% difference in FSA ELA achievement scores from 2018 to 2019, as the skills for both tests are similar there is a distinct correlation between the data.

When looking at grade-level data, there is a 31% gap between the achievement of our students and the state's average in Algebra. This can be attributed to a change in the way that we approach mathematics as a school. Instead of two years of preparation before our low-achieving mathematics students are tested, they are now tested within a year of their first exposure to algebra.

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

At Bayside, the component that showed the most improvement in 2019 was our general mathematics learning gains, increasing from 42% to 46% in 2019. Every sub-group within this component showed increases from 2018 to 2019, with the exception of our multiracial students who had a 41% achievement level in 2018 and dropped to a 23% achievement level in 2019, a significant decline and outlier. The sub-group that showed the largest increase in mathematics learning gains was our Black population increasing from 35% in 2018 to 43% in 2018. During our Power Hour academic intervention, a mathematics lab was offered for all students each day. Students had access to individual instruction during these labs from teachers with various styles and strategies.

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

There are a couple of major causes for concern when analyzing our EWS data for the current school year. Each cohort looks to present its own group of issues. Concerns are:
1. The 2023 cohort has 143 students with below 90% attendance rate and 151 students scoring a

level 1 on any statewide assessment, with 66 students showing failure in either their ELA or Math classes causing a large disparity between course failure and state testing achievement. This is a cause for concern as teacher assessments on the standards should more closely reflect the achievement level of the students.

2. The 2022 cohort had 176-course failures in either Math or ELA in 2019 and 174 students scoring a level 1 on their statewide assessment. This is a great concern for these students as they are not meeting the necessary performance level in either their class or in their state testing.

3. The 2020 cohort shows only a small disparity between two indicators. 64 students failed Math or ELA courses and 27 achieved level 1 on state-wide assessment, so students are failing a class on a subject that they have some knowledge within based on standardized testing. Some investigation about why students are failing the class and performing at a higher level on the test will need to be investigated.

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

1. Addition of PLC Teams
A. Schedule and plan for MESH collaboration day twice a year with district resource teacher.
B. Divide teachers into teams by common subject area.
C. Create a schedule in which they will meet throughout the year.
D. Provide them a document they will complete during their scheduled meetings. The document will include standards addressed, common formative questions/tasks, inclusion of ESE and ELL accommodations, data analysis, and reflection.
E. Inclusion of Skills Days for state assessed areas once per month focusing on specific skills-based needs.
2. Increase Observation and Feedback to Teachers
A. Schedule administration to two observations with feedback per week (one with a partner).
B. Utilize ProGOEE for feedback, including walk-throughs.
C. Use PM in advance to identify ESE students and ensure IEP's are being followed as observed.
3. Addition of Peer Observation Opportunities
A. Revive opportunities where teachers "open their doors" to other teachers to observe and provide feedback.
B. Teachers will email individuals or groups and/or post signs when requesting observers either to showcase a lesson or ask for specific feedback on a new lesson attempted.
C. Clerk will utilize substitutes on campus to allow teachers coverage to observe.
4. Creation of Freshman/Sophomore CMA groups
A. Freshman and Sophomore teachers will work collaboratively to identify and mentor students who require additional supports in the areas of academics, behavior, and attendance.
B. School educational leaders will lead each team and maintain and steer the teams toward school-wide objectives.
5. Restructuring of Power Hour
A. Power hour is being restructured to move away from a lab-based model and instead using individual classrooms for student aid (teacher hours), peer mentors in the media center, and voluntary teachers who can assist any student.
B. As part of the initiative to have student utilize Power Hour in an effective way, Freshman and Sophomore students are being required to attend Power Hour session with their teachers at least twice per week to be checked by their English teacher.
C. Student access to campus has been restricted to a specific area in order to encourage the use of specific teachers during each half of Power Hour while also reducing the supervision ratio of staff to students in order to limit instances of behavioral issues.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	MESH support for SWD and ELL
Rationale	Teachers will be working in Professional Learning Communities centered around their subject area and grade level. This collaboration and mutual accountability allows for professional growth and provides teachers with opportunities to analyze data, choose strategies, implement objectives within their subject area, and implement specific, skills-based lessons. This is necessary to support the achievement levels of each of the core academic area which was unacceptably low last year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We expect to see positive growth in the performance of our students in MESH classes on their standardized tests. Doing so, we will seek to improve the Federal Index of our SWD Subgroup by 4% and increase our ELL subgroup by 6%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	PLCs are part of a six part plan to improve performance across the school. Many parts of these objectives have already been completed. Bayside High School has a collective mission/vision, collective commitments, and has had loosely organized teams. However, Blankstein calls for purposeful meetings with peers centered around data and instruction; we must have PLCs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Blankstein states that effective leaders are ones that situate both themselves and their community around a collective purpose and build a team that can ensure teachers feel as though they can reach that purpose all with the common goal of fostering student growth and success (Blankstein, 2013). This team-based mentality helps support each teacher's sense of self-efficacy. The Visible Learning framework, pioneered by John Hattie, places the collective teacher efficacy at an effect size of 1.39, or the equivalent of over a year's worth of learning (Visible Learning, 2019).
	Blankstein, A. M. (2013). Failure Is Not an Option: 6 Principles That Advance Student Achievement in Highly Effective Schools. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
	Visible LearningTM 250+ Influences on Student Achievement. (2019). Retrieved from https://us.corwin.com/sites/default/files/250_influences_chart_june_2019.pdf

Action Step

Description	1. Create PLC Teams. 2. Hold PLC Meetings implementing all PLC expectations 3. Monitor meeting to find areas of need growth. 4. Collect data. 5. Review PLC implementation.
Person Responsible	Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math and ELA L25 Percentile
Rationale	Of all our decreasing data groups, our progress with our lowest 25th percent took the largest hit. This is due to several factors identified factors, but regardless, the decrease is unacceptable.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We are seeking to improve the performance of our lowest 25th percentile students in both English and Mathematics. We will seek to restore our ELA scores to their previous levels while seeking a 4% gain in mathematics. We will add two MESH collaboration days to work collectively to improve instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will address the achievement gap by ensuring grade appropriate assignments for our students, strong instruction from our teachers, deep engagement in our students, and high expectations all around. Our students in the lowest 25th percentile will be provided all of these things alongside scaffolded supports to aid them in being successful. These objectives have been identified through TNTP's The Opportunity Myth and are central to our approach in both our PLC and CMA groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	TNTP finds that "when all kids get access to grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and high expectations, but particularly when students who start the year behind receive these resources - achievement gaps shrink."
Action Step	
Description	1. Have teachers identify students who are in their lowest 25th percentile and implement common, effective strategies for their success. 2. Implement monthly Power Standards day - teachers will teach lessons on standards-based information and discuss testing strategies that will lead to success when having to exhibit mastery of those standards. 3. CMAs will identify high-needs students and will assign a teacher mentor to those students. 4. PLCs will work collaboratively to ensure that the curriculum and instruction through each subject area and grade level meets the expectation of grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and high expectations. 5. A Guidance counselor will specifically serve the lowest 25th percentile population and seek to provide necessary support for the students and communicate high expectations for the student both in and beyond the classroom.
Person Responsible	Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Underclassmen Interventions for Improved Success
Rationale	After analyzing the Early Warning Signs for the 2022 and 2023 cohorts, it was evident these students needed the implementation of structure and organization to decrease absences and increase attendance for students whose attendance percentage was below 90%, ultimately seeking to decrease course failures in ELA and Mathematics and our number of students who achieve a score of 2 or Lower on ELA and Mathematics state assessments.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	After implementation of the transition program for the 2020 school year to increase teacher and student accountability our all of our EWS data will improve across the board: The number of students receiving referral events will decrease by 3%. ELA and Mathematics course failures will decrease by 3%. Students achieving proficient in ELA and Mathematics standardized tests will increase by 6%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kolby Wolf (wolf.kolby@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	In 2019, our transition program included collective commitments for freshman teachers, a freshman orientation, planners for all freshman and the expectation that they will use them and Power Hour requirements for all freshmen. The freshman teachers came together to implement collective commitments and expectations for the freshman class so that the expectations for all freshmen were consistent throughout all of the student's classes. The freshman orientation was an all-day experience where the students had sessions focused on behavior expectations, responsible Power Hour usage, planner usage, graduation requirements, and how to use social media responsibly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	One of the objectives identified as an achievement gap closer to TNTP's The Opportunity Myth was the conveyance of high expectations to all students. The transition program is specifically tailored to communicate to our students the high expectations that we have of them early and often.
Action Step	
Description	1. Conduct Freshman Orientation Day. 2. Create 9th and 10th-grade teacher CMA groups for student support. 3. Identify 9th and 10th-grade students through EWS data and teacher CMA groups for participation in a teacher mentoring program. 4. Implement a teacher mentoring program. 5. Monitor student performance to determine the efficacy of the program.
Person Responsible	Kolby Wolf (wolf.kolby@brevardschools.org)

#4	
Title	Fostering Teacher Professional Growth
Rationale	In order to lead, you need strong relationships; one powerful facet of those relationships is relational trust. This trust has to be reinforced with multiple positive interactions between leadership and the teachers.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	This plan seeks to improve teacher performance on observations and in the classroom. Teachers will receive timely and relevant feedback, from administration and peers, to improve their practice. As a result, we are seeking to see an increase in the average observational scores of our teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Blankstein emphasizes the importance of relational trust with a study conducted at the University of Chicago in which they found that "high-trust schools were three times more likely to improve in reading and math than those with very weak levels of trust" (p.64). Blankstein, A. M. (2013). Failure Is Not an Option: 6 Principles That Advance Student Achievement in Highly Effective Schools. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on feedback on our site survey, teachers felt that administrative observations were too few and far between affecting the relational trust of our teachers with their administrators. Increased involvement in the classroom should begin to bridge the gap between the teachers' expectations of administrative support for classroom instructional and pedagogical growth and reality in past years.

Action Step	
Description	1. Assign teachers to appropriate administrators in the building to lower the administrator to teacher ratio. 2. Conduct frequent and consistent informal observations. 3. Conduct appropriately modeled formal observations. 4. Provide timely and relevant feedback. 5. Monitor teacher growth in identified areas of need.
Person Responsible	Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.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).