



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Eau Gallie High School

1400 COMMODORE BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

<http://www.eghs.brevard.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Keith Barton E**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/3/2011

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: A (64%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Eau Gallie High School

1400 COMMODORE BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

<http://www.eghs.brevard.k12.fl.us>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School PK, 9-12</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>50%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>40%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	C	B	C

## 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.**

To serve every student with excellence as the standard.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Eau Gallie High School will serve every student in an environment of college and career readiness by delivering the highest quality education in a culture of professionalism, collaboration, and learning.

### 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
Salmon, Jeremy	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? Create mission and vision</li> <li>? Provide support to all stakeholders</li> <li>? Instructional Leader</li> <li>? Create Budget / Respond To Audit</li> <li>? Facilities</li> <li>? Athletics</li> <li>? Discipline</li> <li>? Leadership Development/ Mentor Principal</li> </ul>
Rusch, John	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate Science Dept. teachers and ESE teachers</li> <li>• Administrative contact for Eau Gallie’s ESE program</li> <li>• Work with Instructional Assistance</li> <li>• Review ESE student data to help with the master schedule</li> <li>• A member of the schools MTSS team</li> <li>• School Advisory Council Member</li> <li>• AVID Site team member</li> </ul>
Hinkle, Christopher	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oversee teacher certifications and renewals</li> <li>Ensure teachers follow district curriculum guides</li> <li>Monitor use of curriculum guides and the use of proper texts to ensure pacing is following FLDOE state standards</li> <li>Create and oversee master schedule</li> <li>Track graduation rates</li> <li>Oversee testing and aggregate data from testing</li> </ul>
LeGate , Heather	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Serve as instructional leader</li> <li>- Teacher evaluations</li> <li>- Analyze and aggregate student data</li> <li>- Involve stakeholders in school improvement</li> <li>- Support and build capacity of teachers through professional development</li> <li>- Collaborate with administrative team and stakeholders for the school decision making process</li> <li>- Lead PLC's and cohort groups to ensure consistency across the curriculum</li> </ul>
Baez, Jasmin	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Serve as an instructional leader</li> <li>-Identify areas to improve and support a positive school culture</li> <li>-Manage and positively influence student behavior</li> <li>-Instructional evaluations</li> <li>-AVID site team member</li> <li>-Develop and implement material to support improvement in Biology courses</li> <li>-Collaborate with administrative team and stakeholders for the school decision making process</li> </ul>
Frye, Jason	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsible for curriculum and instruction of American History and American History Honors courses for 10th grade students</li> </ul>



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsible for curriculum and instruction of World History Honors and Pre-Cambridge World History courses for 9th grade students</li> <li>• Coordinated a team of teachers as we created a data driven assessment to track student strengths and weaknesses in preparation for state End of Course Assessment</li> <li>• Chairman of Positive Behavioral Support Committee (PBIS is a team of teachers and administrators who track and adjust discipline and supports in response to data).</li> <li>• Aggregate and analyze data in conjunction with the Administrative Team to determine areas of weakness and strength. Specific examples involve tracking progress of subsets of students.</li> <li>• Sponsor National Beta Club service organization</li> </ul>
<p>Poulos, Cathy</p>	<p>Instructional Coach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-coordinate the implementation of the Cambridge AICE Program curriculum</li> <li>-school liaison &amp; mentor for the Take Stock In Children Scholarship Program</li> <li>-exam officer for the Cambridge international examinations</li> <li>-AVID site team member &amp; mentor</li> <li>-facilitator for the Cambridge Program Professional Learning Community</li> </ul>
<p>Armstrong, Betsy</p>	<p>Teacher, K-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AVID coordinator</li> <li>Coordinate tutors for AVID tutorials in all AVID classes</li> <li>Oversee the AVID site team for the school</li> <li>Deliver instruction in AVID classes</li> <li>Coordinate the mentor team for AVID students</li> <li>Implement and run professional development for faculty and staff</li> </ul>
<p>Kerrigan, Maureen</p>	<p>Instructional Coach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serves as an Instructional Leader – provides PD based on current research and practice</li> <li>• Serves as a Literacy Coach- Carries out job description as described in Brevard’s Literacy Plan set forth by Florida Statute 1011.62. Analyzes data including test scores (formative and summative), to determine next steps for improving reading scores including the lowest 25%. Assists teachers with planning and implementing best practices for literacy. Advises administration in regards to reading issues. Participates on reading adoption committee. Provides staff development for teachers in using the reading and writing standards.</li> <li>• Serves as department chair for ILA- provides administrative communication to ILA teachers, attends regularly scheduled meeting with administration</li> <li>• Attends AVID summer institute and attend site team meeting on a monthly basis</li> <li>• Develops and facilitates PLC(s) based on disciplinary literacy</li> <li>• Builds capacity of teachers- assists with training teachers on current research and best practices for literacy</li> <li>• Assists teachers in analyzing their students’ literacy data, analyzes school wide data for trends to determine strengths and weaknesses resulting in creating a plan for improvement</li> </ul>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Works with administration, guidance counselors, parents, teachers, and students</li> <li>• Participates in leadership team meetings and consults with administration regarding current research and best practices for literacy</li> </ul>
Schleith, David	SAC Member	AICE Physics, Pre-AICE Physics and Physics Honors instructor Astronomy Honors instructor Academic Team Coach Head Freshmen Basketball Coach School Advisory Council Chair
Chace, Jon	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* School Testing Coordinator</li> <li>* 504 Contact</li> <li>* Review School Data and Testing reports</li> <li>* Provides testing information to all stakeholders</li> </ul>
Jones, Shauna	School Counselor	Guidance department chair Oversee Cambridge and Collegiate students and track them and their data to ensure graduation Work with AICE coordinator to ensure proper testing and curriculum are delivered to those students

**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	1	447	496	381	357	1682
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	133	82	74	373
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	1	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	115	65	16	269
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	164	92	55	387

**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	58	119	55	24	256

**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	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	6	4	31

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

99

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/30/2019

**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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	53%	59%	56%	55%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	52%	51%	56%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	40%	42%	49%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	41%	48%	51%	44%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	36%	49%	48%	40%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	45%	45%	27%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	62%	66%	68%	55%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	70%	73%	71%	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	447 (0)	496 (0)	381 (0)	357 (0)	1681 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	84 ( )	133 ( )	82 ( )	74 ( )	373 (0)
One or more suspensions	4 (0)	10 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	18 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	73 (0)	115 (0)	65 (0)	16 (0)	269 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	76 (0)	164 (0)	92 (0)	55 (0)	387 (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	53%	60%	-7%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	52%	59%	-7%	53%	-1%
	2018	57%	61%	-4%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

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	59%	66%	-7%	67%	-8%
2018	55%	67%	-12%	65%	-10%
Compare		4%			

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	68%	71%	-3%	70%	-2%
2018	68%	70%	-2%	68%	0%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	23%	61%	-38%	61%	-38%
2018	31%	62%	-31%	62%	-31%
Compare		-8%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	44%	60%	-16%	57%	-13%
2018	52%	60%	-8%	56%	-4%
Compare		-8%			

**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	17	31	31	23	36	33	38	39		75	37
ELL	33	53	36	32	32	41	38	35		95	39
ASN	79	64					60			100	57
BLK	40	48	34	24	53	57	44	56		81	52

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
HSP	35	43	30	34	33	45	51	62		86	53
MUL	60	52		40	33	36	64	73		90	85
WHT	59	55	43	46	34	47	67	72		86	66
FRL	45	49	38	34	39	53	53	64		80	59
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	22	29	21	17	20	13	26	44		66	25
ELL	12	31	38	21	50	55	5			69	
ASN	100	78						100			
BLK	36	48	36	27	28	10	45	42		86	33
HSP	40	44	37	32	35	28	30	67		76	60
MUL	37	39	44	42	24	21	54	43		81	71
WHT	60	55	46	52	37	34	63	78		84	64
FRL	44	47	39	42	34	29	51	61		76	55
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	20	41	37	22	23	14	38	44		69	27
ELL	7	40	43	16	33	31	19	20		59	60
ASN	83	56		54	54	50	90			83	80
BLK	36	38	48	23	39	35	38	50		68	26
HSP	39	45	40	35	33	25	41	51		75	54
MUL	44	63	76	38	48		32	68		78	60
WHT	62	60	48	49	41	23	63	80		88	62
FRL	43	50	46	35	36	26	44	58		78	48

**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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	610
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	58
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	53
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.**

Our Students with Disabilities, SWD, subgroup showed the lowest overall performance. Traditionally, our SWD population has struggled most with Math and Science. In 2019 we focused the additional push-in support in those classes and saw a 20 point increase in performance learning gains with our lowest 25% SWD in math and an 8 point increase in performance in Science from the 2018 school year. The decrease in performance in ELA and Social Studies could be contributed to the "push-in" focus being in other areas.

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

Both our Social Studies and ELA achievement went down by 5 points for our SWD subgroup. The decrease in performance in ELA and Social Studies could be contributed to the "push-in" focus being in other areas.

**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.**

The overall Math learning gains shows the greatest gap between the school and state average. In recent years, the focus has been on the lowest 25% making learning gains. That subgroup is 3% above the state average indicating the efforts for push in support in those math classes was successful. The overall learning gain data, however, includes the other 75% of students which shows that the push in support should be increased to include the other math classes to support an increase in learning gains overall.

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



Our ELL subgroup Science achievement showed the most improvement from 2018 to 2019 with a 35 point improvement. One contributing factor to Science achievement is the Biology skills day put on by the Science district resource teacher and the teachers in our science department. Our ESE "push-in" teachers focus their efforts on Science and Math classes. The 5 E Inquiry model is followed in the science curriculum and support for ELA has been integrated into all areas with the continued focus on Text-Based Writing in every PLC.

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

The sophomore class, now the Junior class, has 119 students with two or more Early Warning Indicators. That is far more than any other cohort in our population. In fact, this cohort is higher in all indicators than their peers.

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

1. Overall learning gains for math
2. SWD subgroup ELA and Social Studies achievement
3. Continue to reduce the number of behavior issues as indicated by the number of referrals

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ESE Students ELA/Bottom 25%
<b>Rationale</b>	While our L25% SWD/ESE subgroup made a 10 point learning gain in ELA, this achievement is still below the state threshold. Our overall ELA achievement for our SWD/ESE subgroup decreased by 5 points.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our L25% SWD/ESE population will show a 10 point increase in learning gains and overall achievement for SWD/ESE in ELA will increase by 5 points.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Christopher Hinkle (hinkle.christopher@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Eau Gallie High School is an AVID demonstration school and implements AVID strategies schoolwide. Students engage in various research based strategies for learning in all of their classes with ELA and ILA courses included. In addition, writing across the curriculum and focused note taking help to build the students' writing skills throughout their school day. To focus on vocabulary and help increase the students' lexile level, the Frayer model is used in all ELA and ILA classrooms.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The AVID strategies have been found successful in all areas of curriculum. The writing across the curriculum interweaves writing skills throughout the students' entire day offering reinforcement constantly. The Frayer model forces students to dissect the words and does away with misconceptions about the word's meaning.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify bottom 25% ELA students in our SWD/ESE subgroup. Divide those students into small groups to be mentored and supported by the administrative team.</li> <li>2. Insure the fidelity of use of WICOR strategies in all courses and focus "push-in" support in those ELA/ILA classrooms with a high SWD/ESE population</li> <li>3. Use PLC's involving both ELA and ILA teachers to focus on data for our SWD population</li> <li>4. Use writing to learn across the curriculum to support ELA achievement in all content areas with concentration on SWD population.</li> <li>5. Focus our student voice walk-throughs with panel feedback on the instruction for our SWD population ensuring that the SWD population is represented to scale on the panel</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Christopher Hinkle (hinkle.christopher@brevardschools.org)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Bottom 25%
<b>Rationale</b>	While we made a huge leap with our lowest 25% in Math learning gains, there is still work to be done to reach the state threshold.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The lowest 25% will increase by another 10 points in the 2020 school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jasmin Baez (baez.jasmin@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Carnegie math and the MAP growth formative assessment to get a baseline and continuously monitor student progress. AVID strategies are used across the curriculum. We will continue to focus "push-in" support in Math classrooms with a high percentage of SWD/ESE population.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The MAP Growth formative assessment will allow teachers to assess where the students are and where they need support to be more intentional about reaching those students who need extra help. Carnegie math is aligned with the standards to ensure the students are hitting the proper benchmarks while monitoring their progress. The various AVID strategies used, including tutorials, are designed to guide students through a multifaceted approach to all content. Our "push-in" support allows for more one-on-one support and small group instruction.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify the lowest 25% subgroup students and create small groups to be mentored and supported by the administrative team</li> <li>2. Carnegie Math program for Algebra students and implement common formative assessments in the Algebra PLC</li> <li>3. Use the MAP Growth formative assessment to monitor student achievement throughout the year</li> <li>4. Use WICOR strategies with fidelity across the curriculum and focus efforts with push-in" for classes high in SWD populations</li> <li>5. Cross curriculum cohort groups to track progress of SWD and the lowest 25% students in an attempt to raise scores and performance across the curriculum</li> <li>6. Focus student voice walk-throughs with panel feedback in each department with a concentration on those classes that have a high SWD population and by ensuring that the panel has an appropriate number of SWD students on the panel</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jasmin Baez (baez.jasmin@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).**