Eau Gallie High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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

Eau Gallie High School

1400 COMMODORE BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	55%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Salmon, Jeremy	Principal	Create mission and vision Model instructional delivery methods at faculty meetings, observe and guide teachers to best practices in the classroom based on our evaluation rubric Provide support to all stakeholders by taking input and keeping them informed on operations and progress of the school Evaluate and mentor department chairs and administrative staff Create Budget / Respond To Audit Support athletic director and programs to facilitate activities Rule on administrative hearings carried out by the deans Identify future educational leaders and facilitate growth Mentor Principal, guiding Assistant Principals in the Level II Program as well as mentoring active Principals who are new to their role Member of the Neighbor Up Board of Directors a local nonprofit organization that supports our community through the DOCK Teen Center
Rusch, John	Assistant Principal	Evaluate Science Dept. teachers and ESE teachers Administrative contact for Eau Gallie's ESE program Work with Instructional Assistance Review ESE student data to help with the master schedule A member of the schools MTSS team School Advisory Council Member AVID Site team member
Hinkle, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Oversee teacher certifications and renewals Ensure teachers follow district curriculum guides Monitor use of curriculum guides and the use of proper texts to ensure pacing is following FLDOE state standards Create and oversee master schedule Track graduation rates Oversee testing and aggregate data from testing
LeGate , Heather	Assistant Principal	- Serve as instructional leader, guiding teachers to further improve instructional practice through observation and feedback - Teacher evaluations and constructive conversations - Analyze and aggregate student data - Involve stakeholders in school improvement by gathering and analyzing feedback to offer support and create plans for improvement. - Support and build capacity of teachers through professional development - Collaborate with administrative team and stakeholders for the school decision making process - Lead PLC's and cohort groups to ensure consistency across the curriculum
Baez, Jasmin	Assistant Principal	-Serve as an instructional leader by guiding and mentoring teachers in classroom strategies meant to bring out the best results in our students -Identify areas to improve and support a positive school culture

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-Manage and positively influence student behavior -Conduct instructional evaluations to ensure that students and teachers are provided with the best opportunities possible -AVID site team member, provide input and support as we implement AVID strategies across the campus -Develop and implement material to support improvement in Biology courses -Collaborate with administrative team and stakeholders for the school decision making process
Frye, Jason	Teacher, K-12	• Coordinate and manage state and county standardized testing • 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 • 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. • Sponsor National Beta Club service organization
Poulos, Cathy	Instructional Coach	-coordinate the implementation of the Cambridge AICE Program curriculum -school liaison & mentor for the Take Stock In Children Scholarship Program -exam officer for the Cambridge international examinations -AVID site team member & mentor -facilitator for the Cambridge Program Professional Learning Community
Armstrong, Betsy	Teacher, K-12	AVID coordinator Coordinate tutors for AVID tutorials in all AVID classes Oversee the AVID site team for the school Deliver instruction in AVID classes Coordinate the mentor team for AVID students Implement and run professional development for faculty and staff
Kerrigan, Maureen	Instructional Coach	• Serves as an Instructional Leader – provides PD based on current research and practice • 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. • Serves as department chair for ILA- provides administrative communication to ILA teachers, attends regularly scheduled meeting with administration • Attends AVID summer institute and attend site team meeting on a monthly basis

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		• Develops and facilitates PLC(s) based on disciplinary literacy • Builds capacity of teachers- assists with training teachers on current research and best practices for literacy • 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 • Works with administration, guidance counselors, parents, teachers, and students • Participates in leadership team meetings and consults with administration regarding current research and best practices for literacy
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

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/3/2011, Keith Barton E

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
96

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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.	

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	386	457	406	344	1593
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	103	86	63	321
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	2	1	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	57	18	6	119
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	68	31	11	156
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	69	63	41	246
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	86	72	46	267

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	85	110	62	42	299

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	19	69	40	21	149
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	16	1	33

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/5/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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
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

	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	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%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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%	0
English Language Learners	
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%	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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	58
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	53
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.

Since testing was cancelled due to COVID, we are using the previous year's data. Our SWD subgroup showed the lowest overall performance. In the past, our SWD population struggled most in Math and Science. For the 2019 year, we focused our push-in support in our math and science classes and saw a 20 point increase in performance learning gains with our lowest 25% SWD in math and an 8 point increase in in performance in science from the 2018 school year. While math and science showed an increase, ELA and social studies did not. It is thought that this could be because of our push-in support being focused in the science and math classes.

Other data analyzed from the 2020 school year includes common assessment data from math classes. The overall trend in grade distribution as we approached the third quarter was down. The beginning of the 2020 school year showed an average of 74% on common assessments across the three algebra classes, but dropped to an average of 59% at the end of the third quarter. This data is only common assessments given and isn't necessarily an indicator of learning gains to be made. It is common to see a dip in student grade performance during the third quarter due to fatigue.

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

Both social studies and ELA went down by 5 points in our SWD subgroup. The decrease in performance in ELA and social studies could be the result of our push-in support being focused in the science and math classes.
We have spread the push in support to a more equitable distribution across the curriculum for this year.

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.

Our overall math scores on the Algebra EOC show the greatest gap between the school and state average, with a difference of -38%. In recent years the focus has been on the lowest 25% making learning gains. That group is 3% above the state average indicating the efforts for push-in support in those math classes was a success. The overall math learning gains, however, showed a -12 point difference compared to the state data. The beginning of the 2020 school year showed an average of 74% on common assessments across the three algebra classes, but dropped to an average of 59% at the end of the third quarter. This data is only common assessments given and isn't necessarily an indicator of learning gains to be made.This gap indicates a need for more support in all math classrooms. Our MAPS data will continue to serve as a formative assessment to show progress.

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

Our ELL subgroup showed the most improvement in science achievement with a 35 point increase from the 2018 to 2019 school year. One contributing factor is the 5 E inquiry model which is followed in all science curriculum as well as the Biology skills day put on by the district science resource teacher and the teachers in our science department. In addition to skills day, the ESE push-in teachers focus their efforts on science and math classes. To further improvement, and support improvement in ELA, we will continue the 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?

The sophomore class has the highest number of students with two or more early warning indicators. This was the case with last year's sophomore class as well. The course failures in both ELA and Math are higher in this group also.

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

1. SWD subgroup ELA and Math achievement
2. Reduce the risk ratio for suspension among the African American subgroup
3. Positive Culture & Environment
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The SWD subgroup was below the 41% threshold for the 2019 school year data. We did not get data for the 2020 school year from the state. The focus will be with the SWD subgroup and their ELA and Algebra grade distribution and scores. A passing grade on the FSA ELA and the Algebra EOC is a graduation requirement.
Measurable Outcome:	The Federal Index for the SWD in 2019 was 36. While learning gains were made with our lowest 25% for the 2019 school year, we are still off the mark from where we need to be. We hope to increase the overall math learning gains by at least 3 points this year and the FSA ELA learning gains by 3-5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Hinkle (hinkle.christopher@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Writing across the curriculum. Each department has a writing strategy they are utilizing regularly to encourage writing in all subjects. Each department creates a rubric for expectations of the writing being done in that subject area. Continue the use of MAPS for formative assessments and the Carnegie program for support of classroom instructional delivery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If students are writing on a consistent basis, not just in ELA courses, and utilizing a rubric then their overall writing abilities should improve. An improvement in writing ability, along with proficiency utilizing a rubric, should lead to a change in their ability to dissect the text. Formative assessments in math courses will help teachers to see if there was a gap created by the 4th quarter distance learning from the 2019 school year. Using the Carnegie math program will help to close those gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Gather writing strategies and rubrics from each department and continuously compare writing samples throughout the year as evidence of improvement and proficiency in understanding the rubric.The continues use of WICOR strategies campus wide will help ensure a deeper understanding of all content. To support our efforts with WICOR, we will continue to train new teachers on AVID and WICOR strategies.

Person Responsible John Rusch (rusch.john@brevardschools.org)

Review mid term and final exam data from common ELA assessments to ensure improvements are made from one semester to the next and to ensure consistency across all PLC's.

Person Responsible Christopher Hinkle (hinkle.christopher@brevardschools.org)

Monitor the MAPS data for gaps and continue to utilize Carnegie math to help close those gaps. utilize post secondary and/or cares act monies to pay teachers for boot camp/tutoring sessions for test preparation.

Person Responsible Jasmin Baez (baez.jasmin@brevardschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The risk ratio of our African American population for suspensions was 2.86 for the 2020 school year. This is almost full point above the normal threshold of 2 and a full 1 point jump from the previous 2019 school year of 1.76. We are putting a plan in place to monitor referrals and the resulting suspensions to ensure an equitable disciplinary process at Eau Gallie.
Measurable Outcome:	The PBIS team and deans will work to achieve a drop in the risk ratio of suspensions to below the 2.0 threshold.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather LeGate (legate.heather@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We have implemented a proactive approach to the disciplinary process this year. When a student receives a referral for a level 1 or 2 behavior, the deans will perform student observations in the class where the infraction occurred. We will see a reduction in the repeated lower level behaviors that accumulate into a higher level behavior and resulting suspension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was chosen to reduce referrals from repeated infractions by having the student reflect and create a plan to change behavior before it escalates into a suspendable offense. We use the PBIS data that is tracked in the RtiB software. When a student gets his/her first referral, the observation is done before the resulting detention. At the detention, a restorative chat reviewing the observation is conducted. Then the student creates a plan to modify their behavior in the future. This gives the student "buy-in" to the plan and allows for greater accountability in the future.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will hold students accountable in the classroom with a level zero discipline plan for level 1 & 2 infractions. Once the student reaches the point on the teacher's discipline ladder, a referral to the dean will be written.

Person Responsible	Heather LeGate (legate.heather@brevardschools.org)

When referrals written for low level behaviors, the deans will schedule detention and observe student in the classroom before the detention takes place. The dean will have a restorative conference with the student where they have the student reflect on the behavior and, with the assistance of the dean, make a plan for improvement of behavior. The new plan for improvement will be shared with the teacher so that the student, teacher and dean are all aware of the students' goals.

Person Responsible	Heather LeGate (legate.heather@brevardschools.org)

The deans will track referrals and suspensions, reviewing them weekly in the dean's office and monthly at the PBIS meetings. PBIS data will be shared monthly with the PBIS team to assess risk ratio of subgroups and look for trends and opportunities for intervention, specifically with those subgroups that are committing repeated offenses that lead to suspensions.

Person Responsible	Heather LeGate (legate.heather@brevardschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
According to the youth truth survey, students feel the teachers at EGHS come up short when it comes to relating lessons to real world experience and taking an interest in the students' lives outside of class.53% of respondents selected that there was Very Little or None in regard to connection to real world examples as opposed to 46% of BPS as a whole selecting Very Little or None While our minority subgroups answered lower than their peers across the district, it was the Caucasian subgroup who ranked the lowest in feeling their teachers took an interest in them personally, with 53% of white respondents selected that there was Very Little or None.

Measurable Outcome:
Student responses to the 2021 youth truth survey will show an improvement in both real world examples being brought into the classroom and students' feeling their teachers are taking an interest in them as people. We hope to reduce the percentage of students who do not feel their teachers take an interest in them and increase the percentage of the students who feel their teachers connect their lessons to real world lessons by 3% each by focusing our efforts on social emotional strategies such as Sources of Strength, PBIS and student voice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Jason Frye (frye.jason@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
We have implemented Sources of Strength which recruits teachers and students to work together to build relationships across campus and opens a dialogue between students and faculty for conversations about struggles and helps students to realize their support systems for dealing with stress in their academic and personal lives.

EGHS will continue to use student voice walk-throughs to encourage both student buy in and more collaboration between students and teachers, which should foster closer working relationships.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
As stated above, continuing to utilize the student voice walk throughs should continue to build a collaborative atmosphere on campus. As both the students and teachers become more comfortable with the process, the dialogue should become more relaxed and productive allowing for relationships to achieve the depth needed to ensure a mutual respect that is felt by all parties. These walk-throughs, coupled with the sources of strength sessions, should also have a positive impact on the teachers' ability to bring real world experiences and examples into the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

Sources of strength sessions for teachers and students led by Ms. Baez will be held quarterly in the beginning with the end goal to have students meeting monthly facilitated by a small group of teachers.

Person Responsible
Jasmin Baez (baez.jasmin@brevardschools.org)

Student voice walk-throughs will continue quarterly with a different department observed each time. After each round of observations there will be a debriefing with students, teachers, and administration to go over what was learned during the walk-throughs and any suggestions that the students have.

Person Responsible	John Rusch (rusch.john@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The leadership team will continue to foster an environment of growth by facilitating Student Voice walk-throughs, implementing Sources of Strength training for a group of teachers and students, and continuing push-in and resource room support for our math and ELA courses. These measures will help to improve our school culture and support our areas where academic growth are needed.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The YouthTruth survey along with our Student Voice walk-throughs are analyzed to assess the students' perception of their needs.The youth truth survey revealed that 53% of respondents selected that there was Very Little or None as opposed to 46% of BPS as a whole selecting Very Little or None when it came to teachers relating what they are learning in class to their lessons in the real world. When asked about their teachers concern for their lives outside of the classroom, 53% of white respondents selected that there was Very Little or None, which was the lowest response. In an effort to facilitate relationships between faculty and students and open a dialogue to make students feel heard and take ownership in the educational environment, we will continue our student voice walk-throughs. The YouthTruth survey revealed that students feel that their teachers are knowledgeable in their content area with 65% reporting Agree or Strongly agree to "I can tell that my teachers understand the subjects that they are teaching". The highest rated area was Academic Rigor where 54% of respondents reported favorably to Academic Rigor questions.

The insight survey is used to get a feel for the needs of the teachers. We try to focus on feedback given through this survey to show that we are listening and supportive. The latest insight survey shows that, while our teachers are comfortable with and understand the criteria they will be evaluated on and are aware of the administrative team's expectation of them, they do not feel that the person evaluating them has an accurate perception of their performance in the classroom as shown by an 11% drop from the previous year's response to this same question. As an administrative team, we have met with the teachers we evaluate during pre-planning and will be more intentional in our pre and post observation conferences. the

administrative team will ask a set of questions to ensure consistency among our conferences and guide the conversation to demonstrate our intention to fully understand the environment the teacher has created and have a clear picture of their performance in the classroom.

A teacher survey is given to take input from teachers and determine where they feel supported and where there is a need for growth. Teachers are all very complimentary of the administrative team and our 'open door' policy. 95% feel they can come to us with anything and be heard. Teachers do feel they need more follow through from administration with regard to being visible around campus and feedback. Implementation of the new discipline intervention observation form should help them feel like there is a more complete process and follow up with regard to referrals they write, while increasing the amount that the deans are in classrooms.

Our PBIS program is comprised of staff and administration as well as the school psychologist. This year we are going to reach out to recruit parents for this team to increase the number of stakeholders that are involved in this effort.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00