

Brevard Public Schools

# Bayside High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## 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>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Bayside High School

1901 DEGROODT RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Holli Zander A**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
<b>2019-20 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<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>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](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>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

## Bayside High School

1901 DEGROODT RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

### School Grades History

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

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

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

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

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

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

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 6/3/2019, Holli Zander A

**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.*

0

**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.*

3

### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

93

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
<b>2019-20 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<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>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	400	477	371	329	1577
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	73	41	36	216
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	41	23	7	119
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	66	52	20	215
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	26	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	85	63	40	253
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	45	0	0	112

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	82	101	63	52	298	

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	17	86	43	23	169	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	7	1	24	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/20/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	136	79	34	384

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	136	79	34	384

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	59%	56%	55%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	52%	51%	46%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	40%	42%	37%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	45%	48%	51%	45%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	49%	48%	34%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	45%	45%	31%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	66%	66%	68%	64%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	70%	73%	61%	67%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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	60%	60%	0%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	54%	59%	-5%	53%	1%
	2018	51%	61%	-10%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	66%	-2%	67%	-3%
2018	65%	67%	-2%	65%	0%
Compare		-1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	71%	-12%	70%	-11%
2018	64%	70%	-6%	68%	-4%
Compare		-5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	61%	-31%	61%	-31%
2018	30%	62%	-32%	62%	-32%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	60%	-7%	57%	-4%
2018	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%
Compare		7%			

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	31	32	22	34	22	45	41		68	54
ELL	17	31	26	17	42	50	20	20		73	45
BLK	35	54	43	33	43	36	49	41		85	68
HSP	50	44	35	38	44	40	58	61		88	73

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
MUL	48	50	43	29	23		41	67		87	85
WHT	63	49	33	56	50	31	78	67		83	76
FRL	46	46	34	39	42	34	62	54		81	73
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	44	41	16	28	24	26	42		74	51
ELL	24	53		10	38	40				63	60
BLK	40	48	36	27	35	33	46	53		86	59
HSP	54	61	54	39	42	55	62	63		79	67
MUL	50	42	31	45	41		72	76		83	55
WHT	61	57	51	51	45	27	77	69		88	70
FRL	50	52	44	40	39	31	63	60		83	64
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	13	27	28	23	27	18	30	29		63	30
ELL	14	25	27	36						67	
BLK	44	38	24	34	26	20	52	43		83	59
HSP	50	48	43	48	34	28	62	55		82	69
MUL	53	44		46	36		52	71		92	71
WHT	62	50	45	48	37	39	70	70		83	71
FRL	49	43	34	41	33	31	62	53		79	62

### ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	52
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	53
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	59
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	51
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.

In 2019, our mathematics lowest 25th percentile scored at a 34% achievement level, which is a 2% decrease in the prior year's performance. A strong contributing factor to the decrease in the performance for all subgroups of our lowest 25th percentile was the dissolution of our BEST program, which was an academic intervention for our lowest 25th percentile, and focused resources on their performance. In addition, we also switched from an ALG 1A/1B model and embraced an ALG 1 only model.

During the 2020 school year, Bayside's math department used data-driven PLC's to target our lowest 25th percentile population achievement gap by ensuring the implementation of grade-appropriate and rigorous content for our students, strong teacher efficacy, and high levels of student engagement. Our students in the lowest 25th percentile were provided all of these, along with scaffolded supports to aid them in being successful. These objectives, which have been identified through TNTP are central to our approach in both our PLC groups, which will continue to be areas of focus and growth for the 2020-2021 school year. In addition, according to the ESSA data SWD and ELL subgroups fell below 41%

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

Due to COVID 19 and the lack of new assessment data, we will continue to use our data from 2019. The 2019 data used was, ELA Lowest 25th Percentile which dropped to 37%. This is 5% below the state average. The ELA Lowest 25th percentile White and Hispanic sub-groups of students, decrease from 54% proficiency in 2018, to 35% in 2019. In 2020, our action steps included the identification of each teacher's lowest 25%, the implementation of power standards, and PLC's for high-risk students and to ensure that the curriculum and instruction through each subject area and meets grade level expectations. This includes high level instruction, high student engagement, and rigorous content. In 2020, we will continue on this data component throughout the 20-21 SY.

#### 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.

Due to COVID 19, we will continue to use the 2018-2019 data. It was identified that there was a 13% achievement gap between school and state average on the U.S. History EOC. We will continue looking at Algebra grade-level data, where there was a 31% gap between the achievement of our students and the state's average. Contributing factors included the lack of testing for 42 Advanced Placement United States History students which accounts for 10% of the 2021 Cohort. Additionally, within the same classroom, the students went through a teacher transition in the middle of the third nine weeks. These factors had an effect on all of our subgroups, as there were decreases in achievement scores in each of the reported subgroups. It must also be mentioned that this cohort also had a 6% difference in FSA ELA achievement scores from 2018 to 2019, as the skills for both tests are similar, and there is a distinct correlation between the data. 2019-2020 SIP action steps included , PLC's to ensure that the curriculum and instruction through each subject area meets grade level expectations. This includes high level instruction, high student engagement, and rigorous content.

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

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

### **Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

There are a couple of major causes for concern when analyzing our EWS data for the current school year. Each cohort looks to present its own group of issues. Concerns are:

1. The 2023 cohort has 143 students with below 90% attendance rate and 151 students scoring a level 1 on any statewide assessment, with 66 students showing failure in either their ELA or Math classes causing a large disparity between course failure and state testing achievement.
2. The 2022 cohort had 176-course failures in either Math or ELA in 2019 and 174 students scoring a level 1 on their statewide assessment. This is a great concern for these students as they are not meeting the necessary performance level in either their class or on state testing.

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

1. ELA achievement gap of our lowest 25%, ELL and SWD
2. Teacher efficacy in blended learning
3. Increase attendance for both brick and mortar and eLearning students.
4. Increase student proficiency on the U.S. History EOC
5. Increase student proficiency on the Algebra EOC

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Instructional Practices specifically relating to the ELA literacy gap of our lowest 25%
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	Rationale: ELA-Literacy scores were not tested for the 2020 school year. But, the prior year's ELA data showed a decrease in the lowest 25% scores by 4%.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Bayside high school will continue to monitor ELA-Literacy scores for our lowest 25%. ELA measurable outcome will increase by 4% for our lowest 25% of ELA learners.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Tiffany Crews (crews.tiffany@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will address the ELA literacy gap for our lowest 25% with a focus on ELL students and SWD by providing individualized learning opportunities using tutors for students. These individualized opportunities will enable students to take a more active role in their ELA literacy abilities.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We believe that learners are most successful when they are mindful of themselves as learners and thinkers. Tutoring will allow our lowest 25% to take more of an active role in filling their own learning gaps they have. According to Mentoring.org, mentoring has significant positive effects on high levels of absenteeism and recurring behavior problems. These are two early warning indicators that a student may be falling off-track. In 2007, Kennelly and Monrad reported that students who meet regularly with their mentors are 52% less likely than their peers to skip a day of school and 37% less likely to skip a class. Thurlow, Sinclair & Johnson (2002) found that young adults who face an opportunity gap, but have a mentor are 55% more likely to be enrolled in college than those who did not have a mentor.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers make contact with students that are engaged less than 80% of the time during the first two weeks of school and document contact in FOCUS.
2. Teachers will submit names of students after the third week of school to administrative staff that is engaged less than 80% of the time using the Underperforming Student Referral document.
3. Administrative staff and guidance will make contact, which may include home visits, to the disengaged students to identify barriers to engagement.
4. Barriers to engagement will be identified, and students will be assigned an administrative mentor to assist in overcoming these barriers.
5. Before school and after school technology assistance will be available for students that are disengaged online to eliminate barriers to engagement.
6. Cost from COVID cares act \$24,516.00 (3 teaching tutors, 1 mentor facilitator, 25 total mentors, and 1 instructional ELL assistant)
7. Implement Bayside Achievement Mentorship

**Person Responsible** Tiffany Crews (crews.tiffany@brevardschools.org)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Bayside teachers will be utilizing blended learning strategies during the 2020/2021 school year to ensure an equitable education for every student. Those students, whose attendance and engagement levels drop below 90%, will have administrative staff contacting them within their community. This outreach is designed to engage and support all struggling students with their educational efforts while providing personal and emotional support if necessary.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase attendance rates for targeted groups that drop below 90%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kate Setterbo (setterbo.kate@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will address our current attendance issues through home visits by the administration.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** As Wright et al. (2018) stated, "Home visits positively influence students' academic and behavioral functioning in school. Students who have home visits through the school system's program had significantly higher academic achievement, as well as motivation when compared to other students who were not visited" (p. 88). Wright, K. B., Shields, S. M., Black, K., & Waxman, H. C. (2018). The effects of teacher home visits on student behavior, student academic achievement, and parent involvement. School Community Journal, 28(1), 67-90.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers make contact with students that are engaged less than 90% of the time during the first two weeks of school and document contact in FOCUS.
2. Teachers will submit names of students after the third week of school to administrative staff that are disengaged, underperforming, or are attendance concerns using the Underperforming Student Referral and the MTSS process.
3. Administrative staff and guidance will make contact, which may include home visits, to the disengaged students in order to identify barriers to engagement.
4. Barriers to engagement will be identified, and students will be assigned a mentor through the Bayside Achievement Mentorship Program to assist in overcoming these barriers.
5. Before school and after school technology assistance will be available for students that are disengaged online to eliminate barriers to engagement.

**Person Responsible:** Kate Setterbo (setterbo.kate@brevardschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching**

	Providing teachers with Professional Development on blended-learning strategies to improve content delivery and student engagement.
<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	After reviewing the attendance data and grading data from the 4th nine-weeks, it is evident that teachers need specific training to improve student engagement levels along with content delivery strategies for students who are enrolled in digital schooling. Blended learning is a teaching strategy that supports the multiple schooling opportunities provided to students during the 2020/2021 school year.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Percentage of teachers using technology appropriately to enhance blended learning engagement
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will be addressing the digital learning data from the 4th nine weeks grading report provided from the district.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>“Educational research suggests blended courses are more effective compared to both face-to-face and online. A 2009 US Department of Education report examined fifty-one empirical studies comparing online education with traditional face-to-face courses and concluded, “students who took all or part of their class online performed better, on average than those taking the same course ... face-to-face” (Yates et al. 2009, p. xiv).”</p> <p>Stein, J., &amp; Graham, C. R. (2020). Essentials for blended learning: A standards-based guide. New York: Routledge.</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

August 11, 2020: District Blended Learning PD - provided all faculty with information on how to manage multiple on-line platforms on an individual bases. This professional development allowed for more individual processing and the ability for faculty to revisit various areas of interest.

August 17, 2020: Round Robin PD - provided and extension of the district professional development in small, course specific groups for additional support.

Group A = ELA/Guidance/PE/World Languages

Group B = Social Studies/Reading

Group C = Science/CTE

Group D = Math/ESE

Throughout the year Friday P.D. - provides opportunities for faculty to revisit various virtual and technological supports.

September 4, 2020 - Google Training - Mrs. Martin

October 2, 2020 - Zoom Training - Mrs. Spivey

February 5, 2021 - Focus Training - Mr. Flesher

ESE Support with Ms. Maillet and Ms. Turco - supports specifically connecting technology with ESE students and faculty in a small group setting.

8:15 – 9:00 Group: A

9:15 – 10:00 Group: B

10:15 – 11:00 Group: C

11:15 – 12:00 Group: D

Monitoring will be done by utilizing classroom walkthroughs conducted by administrative and peer observations. Teachers will receive feedback through ProGOEE by administrators and feedback forms by peers.

**Person Responsible** Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.org)

#### #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Utilizing results from Reading Plus and MAPS (formative assessments) to target and fill the needs of specific students through teacher instruction.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

With the lack of testing data from the 2019/2020 school year, school instructional leadership will be actively engaged with teachers. This engagement will focus on using various data sources, both formative and summative, to drive current instructional practices.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Student achievement on 2021 Reading and Math FSA

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

John Johnson (johnson.john@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Utilize formative assessment data to provide appropriate instructional interventions and placement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

“Since a major goal of formative assessment is to obtain a clear picture of how well students are progressing, teachers need to gather assessment data from all students.” Knight, J., & Learning Forward. (2013). High-impact instruction: A framework for great teaching.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Administer Reading Plus and MAPS assessments.
2. Analyze Reading plus data to determine appropriate placement and intervention.
  - a. Add/remove students from ILA classes based on Reading Plus data and prior FSA achievement levels.
  - b. Provide content and elective teachers with assessment data so they provide appropriate interventions for students that are working below grade level.
3. Analyze MAPS data to determine appropriate placement and intervention.
  - a. Adjust students' math interventions based on MAP data and prior FSA achievement levels.
  - b. Provide content and elective teachers with assessment data so they provide appropriate interventions for students that are working below grade level.
4. Provide Performance Matters and FOCUS PD so teachers can access this data independently.
5. Identify SWD and ELL students that could benefit from tutoring and provide them with tutoring opportunities.
6. Assign students a mentor through the Bayside Achievement Mentorship Program.

**Person Responsible** John Johnson (johnson.john@brevardschools.org)

**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Use proactive identification (EWS) to support students through MTSS.
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	Being proactive and identifying students who need support socially, emotionally, and academically is the key to equitable education for each student.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	This extra layer of attention by the administration will increase student engagement and provide for equitable education for our at-risk students. Measurable outcomes will be a decrease in student behavior (referrals) and an increase in student attendance.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Naim Torlak (torlak.naim@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The basic elements of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) are required by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004). According to Florida Administrative Code: 6A-6.0331 General Education Intervention Procedures, Evaluation, Determination of Eligibility, Reevaluation and the Provision of Exceptional Student Education Services, "It is the local school district's responsibility to develop and implement a multi-tiered system of support which integrates a continuum of academic and behavioral interventions for students who need additional support to succeed in the general education environment."
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Having an instructional leader actively searching for those who may benefit from our school's MTSS is another layer of protection for our most vulnerable students. This action will ensure that each of our students is given every opportunity to be supported in these unusual and unprecedented times.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administer Reading Plus and MAPS assessments.
2. Analyze Reading Plus and MAPS engagement for students that are eLearning and brick and mortar.
3. Identify students not participating in these assessments.
4. Refer identified students to MTSS to determine appropriate interventions.

**Person Responsible** Naim Torlak (torlak.naim@brevardschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Students with a deficiency in reading will be placed in appropriate courses which will be coded in AS400 as providing intervention. These courses will include World History and U.S. History which will also increase proficiency on the U.S. History EOC.**

**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.

### Youth Truth Analysis

Students at Bayside High were surveyed in January 2020 about their perceptions of the school in terms of Engagement, Academic Rigor, Relationships, Belonging & Peer Collaboration, Culture, College & Career Readiness, and Academic Support Services.

Compared to other participating high schools, Bayside High's highest-rated themes were: Engagement & College & Career Readiness.

Compared to other participating high schools, Bayside High's highest-rated question within the key themes was:

- I try to do my best in school (Engagement)

We will continue to have high expectations for our students and believe students can get a good grade if they try.

The lowest rated themes were: Culture & Relationships.

The lowest rated questions within the key themes were:

- How many of your teachers make an effort to understand what your life is like outside of school? (Relationships) Most students in this school treat adults with respect. (Culture)

In order to address these concerns, the following will be implemented:

- Trauma Informed Classroom professional development
- Complete BHS Mental/Emotional Health and Social Emotional Learning (schedules posted)
- Implement Bayside Achievement Mentoring (B.A.M.) Program
- Tutoring opportunities (in-person and virtual)
- Increased guidance conferences and administrative conferences among stakeholders (i.e. students and teachers)

### Insight Survey Analysis

Faculty was surveyed using the Insight Survey in school year 2020.

The results revealed that the the highest rating was with Evaluation which included communication of performance expectations, teacher agreeability regarding accurate representation of rubric and evaluation results.

We will continue working with our faculty on updates regarding the evaluation rubrics and meet with faculty to discuss informal and formal observations.



The lowest rating was in the area of Learning Environment which included concerns surrounding classroom misbehavior and inconsistent discipline as well as student apathy/rebellion toward school/work.

In order to address these concerns, the following will be implemented:

- A discipline committee, comprised of administration and faculty, will meet throughout the school year to discuss concerns and problem solve issues.
- Our SAC committee, comprised of school faculty, administration, parents and students will meet monthly to discuss disciplinary concerns and problem solve issues.
- Implement Bayside Achievement Mentoring (B.A.M.) Program
- Tutoring opportunities (in-person and virtual)

### Parent Survey

Parents were surveyed using the Parent Survey in school year 2020.

The results revealed that 94% of parents felt welcome coming to the campus. We will continue to acknowledge parents as they enter campus and provide positive customer service.

The results also revealed that 87% of parents believe that email is the best way to communicate important information regarding school events or student progress and 91% of parents responded that more information about school issues and how to become engaged would assist them in playing a more active role in decision making.

The following will be implemented:

- Principal Update emails will be sent twice a month containing school issues and ways to engage as an active stakeholder.
- The School Advisory Council will increase its membership to accurately reflect the population of the school.

### 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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00