

Brevard Public Schools

Palm Bay Magnet Senior High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Palm Bay Magnet Senior High School

101 PIRATE LN, Melbourne, FL 32901

<http://www.palmbay.hs.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Karl Kaminski J

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2019

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)	99%
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: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: B (59%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Palm Bay Magnet Senior High School

101 PIRATE LN, Melbourne, FL 32901

<http://www.palmbay.hs.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	69%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

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

Palm Bay Magnet High stakeholders provide a caring, supportive environment where students and faculty can collaborate on strong academics and life based education leading our students toward being confident and competent community members.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Palm Bay Magnet High School will provide high quality, innovative instructional programs that promote choice, equity, diversity, and academic excellence for all students. We are committed to offering high interest S.T.E.A.M. related programs that excite and prepare our students for the rigors of college and career.

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
Kaminski, Jud	Principal	Principal Kaminski serves as the beacon of PBMHS as he engages all stakeholders and collaborates in the school's decision making process.
Owens, Angela	Assistant Principal	Ms. Owens serves as the instructional leader of PBMHS, engages stake holders and collaborates in the school's decision making process.
Fox, Patricia	Instructional Coach	Patricia Fox serves as an instructional leader who facilitates professional development sessions for our faculty focusing on the School Improvement Plan Goals In order to impact student achievement.
Fahy, Paul	Assistant Principal	Mr. Fahy serves as an instructional leader of PBMHS, engages stake holders and collaborates in the school's decision making process.
Storer, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Jen Storer serves as an instructional coach by facilitating professional learning that is in the school improvement plan.
Flewellyn, Marise	Assistant Principal	Ms. Flewellyn serves as an instructional leader of PBMHS, engages stake holders and collaborates in the school's decision making process.
Colona, Stefany		Ms. Colona is head guidance counselor and ensures our students
Cooke, Julie	Instructional Media	Ms. Cooke serves as an instructional leader at PBMHS, facilitates professional learning that upholds the SIP and serves as the contact with the dual enrollment 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	0	0	371	430	342	279	1422
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	80	37	35	235
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	106	62	40	329
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	128	27	19	219
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	207	76	48	449

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	100	155	44	28	327

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	48	106	71	12	237	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	31	14	11	72	

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

95

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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	173	228	180	112	693
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	139	63	34	355
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	51	23	3	101
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	159	86	31	389

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	119	101	128	45	393

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	42%	59%	56%	40%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	52%	51%	43%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	40%	42%	36%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	28%	48%	51%	24%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	41%	49%	48%	30%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	45%	45%	30%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	44%	66%	68%	48%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	70%	73%	41%	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	371 (0)	430 (0)	342 (0)	279 (0)	1422 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	83 ()	80 ()	37 ()	35 ()	235 (0)
One or more suspensions	121 (0)	106 (0)	62 (0)	40 (0)	329 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	45 (0)	128 (0)	27 (0)	19 (0)	219 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	118 (0)	207 (0)	76 (0)	48 (0)	449 (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	40%	62%	-22%	55%	-15%
	2018	44%	60%	-16%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	44%	59%	-15%	53%	-9%
	2018	41%	61%	-20%	53%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	43%	66%	-23%	67%	-24%
2018	47%	67%	-20%	65%	-18%
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	58%	71%	-13%	70%	-12%
2018	58%	70%	-12%	68%	-10%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	16%	61%	-45%	61%	-45%
2018	28%	62%	-34%	62%	-34%
Compare		-12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	60%	-23%	57%	-20%
2018	32%	60%	-28%	56%	-24%
Compare		5%			

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	12	32	33	9	28	31	24	23		71	20
ELL	22	43	38	20	48	60	28	22		58	43
ASN				55							
BLK	24	43	41	17	32	28	32	45		79	42
HSP	46	45	27	30	49	48	45	58		82	51
MUL	50	64	58	40	43		58	65		81	50
WHT	52	50	47	35	44	63	52	71		83	54
FRL	37	44	38	26	40	38	39	53		80	45
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	11	30	26	16	41	42	23	28		70	27
ELL	17	31	32	25	45		18	29		57	
ASN	45	64									
BLK	26	37	38	21	36	40	26	48		66	40
HSP	40	42	33	27	41	29	51	48		75	51
MUL	56	52	30	31	47		53	77		65	60
WHT	49	45	29	46	46	40	60	70		83	52
FRL	36	40	32	29	43	39	43	57		73	40
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	4	22	30	6	22	30	21	20		63	5
ELL	10	16	11	19	38	36		22		75	42
ASN	40	40		36	18					86	42
BLK	26	34	22	12	23	26	29	35		78	37
HSP	37	39	38	20	27	31	31	39		77	55
MUL	47	47		27	30		60	32		90	52

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
WHT	49	49	46	35	36	33	68	48		82	51
FRL	32	39	35	19	28	31	39	35		78	41

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	40
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	55
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
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	55
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	45
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.

Algebra 1 EOC showed the lowest performance.

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

Algebra 1 EOC showed the greatest decline as it dropped from 28% scoring level 3 or above in 2017-2018 to 16% scoring level 3 or above in 2018-2019. The lack of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students as well as not having an instructional coaching model nor a means to progress monitor contributed to the decline.

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 (Biology) had the greatest gap compared to the state as PBMHS scored 44% scoring level 3 or above in 2017-2018 compared to 68% state passing rate. Factors that contributed to the decline include a lack of common planning time coupled with not focusing on the tested standards.

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

ELA Learning Gains of the lowest 25% improved from 34% to 42%. Focused CMA's targeting the standards that proved challenging for students, progress monitoring and common bell work focused on the needs of our students.

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

32% of our students scored a level 1 in ELA or Math and 23% had at least 1 or more ISS or OSS.

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

1. Increase Algebra 1 performance
2. Increase Biology 1 performance
3. Learning Gains in math and ELA for Students with Disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase the Algebra 1 Performance
Rationale	16% of students scored level 3 or above in 2018-2019 compared to 28% in 2017-2018,
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	30% of students will score level 3 or above as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	CMA Collaboration and Planning Time
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Recent research has suggested that teacher collaboration has positive outcomes for teachers. Goddard and Goddard (2010) discovered from their research that teachers reported improved attitudes towards teaching, teacher efficacy, and understanding of student learning. Teachers discussed having a shared sense of responsibility (Williams, 2010).
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administration will establish monthly CMA meeting dates for the year. 2. Teachers will collaborate with district resource teachers and school instructional coach during pre-planning and CMA's. 3. Teachers will analyze data, determine needs based on specific standards and plan next steps. 4. Algebra 1 teachers will progress monitor with MAP, analyze data and inform instruction based on student needs. 5. Student Survey assessing student engagement will be given during first grading period and teachers will use data to inform instruction. 6. Instructional Coach will pull students based on need to utilize 1 on 1 instruction. 7. Algebra 1 will have two additional district planning days. 8. Classroom Walk Throughs will occur monthly with the instructional coaches to look for trends which will improve instruction.
Person Responsible	Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Increase the Biology 1 Performance
Rationale	Biology had the greatest gap compared to the state as 44% scored level 3 or above 2018-2019 compared to 66% of the district and 68% of the state scoring 3 or above.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Admins will collect and analyze CMA data collection guides quarterly and will support monthly CMA meetings as well as district supported department planning days.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Focused Note Taking
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research by Herman Ebbinghaus (1913) found the power of repetition in the note-taking process. Without reviewing and thinking about notes, the note-taker's knowledge of the content drops 58% only 20 minutes after information is first learned. After one day, they retain only 33.7% of the information. Ebbinghaus discovered that revisiting and interacting with content multiple times reactivates learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate Focused Note-Taking refresher during pre-planning. 2. Teachers and instructional coach will plans lessons in CMA's incorporating strategies for note-taking, processing notes, analyzing data and planning next steps. 3. Enrichment / Skills Days for Biology will incorporate Focused Note-Taking. 4. TGIM Homeroom Mini Lessons will incorporate FNT regularly throughout the year to provide practice. 5. Classroom Walk Throughs targeting CBC (Common Board Configuration) and evidence of focused notes taking and processing will occur weekly.
Person Responsible	Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Increase Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities
Rationale	32% of Students with Disabilities had learning gains compared to 48% of the school's ELA learning gains 28% of Students with Disabilities had learning gains compared to 41% of the school's Math learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	40% of Students with Disabilities will have learning gains in ELA and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	CMA Collaboration and Planning Time
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Recent research has suggested that teacher collaboration has positive outcomes for teachers. Goddard and Goddard (2010) discovered from their research that teachers reported improved attitudes towards teaching, teacher efficacy, and understanding of student learning. Teachers discussed having a shared sense of responsibility (Williams, 2010).
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administration will establish monthly CMA meeting dates for the year. 2. Teachers will analyze data, determine needs based on specific standards and plan next steps. 3. Teachers will progress monitor with MAP and Reading Plus Insight Assessment to, analyze data and inform instruction based on student needs. 4.. Instructional Coaches will pull students based on need to utilize 1 on 1 instruction. 5. Algebra 1 will have two additional district planning days. 6. Teachers will incorporate focused note taking into curriculum 6. District ELA Resource Teacher will facilitate half day pd on The Writing Revolution. 7. Teachers will mentor targeted students weekly to foster academic / social emotional excellence. 8. Classroom Walk Throughs will occur monthly with the instructional coaches to look for trends to improve instruction.
Person Responsible	Angela Owens (owens.angela@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).