

Brevard Public Schools

# Palm Bay Magnet Senior 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>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# 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: 1/6/2016

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 99%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (48%)<br>2017-18: C (46%)<br>2016-17: C (42%)<br>2015-16: C (44%)  |
| <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>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## 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<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>9-12                              | No                     | 71%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 60%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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, including overseeing curriculum, budget, and staff.   |
| Owens, Angela     | Assistant Principal | Ms. Owens serves as the instructional leader of PBMHS, by monitoring the curriculum and managing any curricular needs. She also engages stakeholders and collaborates in the school's decision making process and is the administrator in charge of the Teacher Induction Program.  |
| Fox, Patricia     | Instructional Coach | Ms. Fox is an instructional leader who facilitates professional development sessions for our faculty focusing on the School Improvement Plan Goals. In order to impact student achievement, collaborates in the school's decision making process, monitors the reading classes and promotes literacy across the curriculum. In addition she oversees the New Teacher Induction Program.           |
| Fahy, Paul        | Assistant Principal | Mr. Fahy serves as an instructional leader of PBMHS, engages stakeholders and collaborates in the school's decision making process. He also monitors facility needs to ensure the environment is safe and conducive to student learning.  |
| Storer, Jennifer  | Instructional Coach | Jen Storer is an instructional leader who facilitates professional learning that is in the school improvement plan. In addition she monitors and collaborates with the science and math departments and provides teacher curricular input into the school's decision making process.  |
| Flewellyn, Marise | Dean                | Ms. Flewellyn serves as an instructional leader at PBMHS, engages stakeholders and collaborates in the school's decision making process. In addition, she is Dean of Student Services and works diligently to implement Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies. She also oversees our gifted student population to ensure these students are correctly identified and academically challenged. |
| Colona, Stefany   |                     | Ms. Colona is the head guidance counselor and ensures our students meet the graduation requirements so that they will achieve success in college and career. She oversees each student's academic history and progress to ensure they meet district and state requirements.   |
| Harris, Tonny     | Dean                | Mr. Harris serves as an instructional leader at PBMHS, engages stakeholders and collaborates in the school's decision making process. In addition, he is Dean of Student Services and works diligently to implement Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies with fidelity in order to best promote positive school student behaviors and cultures.  |

## Demographic Information



**Principal start date**

Wednesday 1/6/2016, Karl Kaminski J

**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.*

14

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

92

**Demographic Data**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 99%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (48%)<br>2017-18: C (46%)<br>2016-17: C (42%)<br>2015-16: C (44%)  |
| <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 | 315 | 405 | 286 | 281 | 1287  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88  | 131 | 77  | 68  | 364   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97  | 113 | 64  | 48  | 322   |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 43  | 9   | 6   | 67    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 50  | 15  | 11  | 85    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88  | 9   | 27  | 37  | 161   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95  | 24  | 45  | 23  | 187   |
|   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 103 | 66 | 52 | 335   |

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 | 14 | 22 | 8  | 11 | 55    |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/6/2020

### 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 | 371 | 430 | 342 | 279 | 1422  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 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 | 121 | 106 | 62  | 40  | 329   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 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 | 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    |

**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 | 371 | 430 | 342 | 279 | 1422  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 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 | 121 | 106 | 62  | 40  | 329   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 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 | 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    |

## 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  |       |
|           | (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 | 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                  |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| HSP                                       | 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                  |
| 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%      | 2   |
| 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%       | 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   | 55  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| 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% | 0   |
| 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%               | 0   |
| 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%            | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |

| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |
| 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%                      | 0   |
| 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% | 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.**

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. Not having an instructional coaching model nor a means to progress monitor students contributed to the decline. In addition, the CWT data indicates the lack of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students was a factor.

**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 2018-2019 compared to 68% state passing rate. Factors that contributed to the decline include a lack of common planning time and not focusing on the tested standards during daily classroom instruction.

**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?**



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. Increase Learning Gains in math and ELA for Students with Disabilities

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

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>              | Description: Increase Algebra 1 Performance   |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b> | Rationale: 28% of our students scored level 3 or above in 2018-2019 compared to 34% in 2017-2018. |

**Measurable Outcome:** 40% 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 Steps to Implement**

1. Administration will establish monthly CMA meeting dates for the year for all teachers.
2. Teachers will collaborate with district resource teachers and school instructional coaches during pre-planning and CMA's.
3. Teachers will analyze data, determine needs based on specific standards and plan common formative assessments to specially focus on the needs of our students.
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 1st 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 in order to provide common, focused instruction.
8. Classroom walk-throughs will occur monthly with the instructional coaches to look for trends which will improve instruction.
9. ESE,ELL, and African American students are individually monitored and mentored by staff weekly.

**Person Responsible** Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)

Leadership team will conduct classroom walk-throughs and provide feedback to teachers quarterly.

**Person Responsible** Jud Kaminski (kaminski.jud@brevardschools.org)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>                              | Description: Increase Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities  |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b>                 | Rationale: 32% of Students with Disabilities had ELA learning gains compared to 48% of the school's ELA learning gains in 2019 and 28% of Students with Disabilities had learning gains compared to 41% of the school's Math learning gains in 2019.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | 40% of Students with Disabilities will have learning gains in ELA and Math.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | CMA Collaboration and Planning Time  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Recent research has suggested that teacher collaboration has positive outcomes for teachers. Goddard and Goddard (2010) discovered that teachers reported improved attitudes towards teaching, teacher efficacy, and understanding of student learning through collaboration. Teachers discussed having a shared sense of responsibility (Williams, 2010). |

**Action Steps to Implement**

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. ESE teachers are provided individual academic student data and will use this information to guide and differentiate instruction. In addition, IEP's outline individual student academic support strategies.
4. Teachers and Coaches will progress monitor with MAP and Reading Plus Insight Assessments to analyze data and inform instruction based on student needs.
5. Instructional Coaches will pull students based on need to utilize 1 on 1 instruction.
6. All teachers will incorporate Focused Note Taking into curriculum.
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 identify trends to improve instruction.

**Person Responsible** Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>                              | Description: Increase the Biology 1 Performance   |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b>                 | Rationale: Biology had the greatest gap compared to the state as 44% scored level 3 or above 2018-2019 compared to 66% of th district and 68% of the state scoring 3 or above.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | 50% of students will score level 3 or above on the Biology EOC.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Focused Note Taking   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Research by Herman Ebbinghaus (1913) found the power of repetition in the not-taking process. Without reviewing and critically thinking about notes, the note taker's retention of content, drops to 58% only 20 minutes after information is first learned. After one day, they retain only 33.7% of the information. Ebbinghuas discovered that revisiting and interacting with content multiple times cements learning. Reviewing notes 5 times is the goal. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Facilitate Focused Note Taking refresher during pre-planning.
2. Teachers and instructional coaches will plan standard based lessons in CMA's incorporating strategies for note-taking, processing notes, analyzing data to plan next steps..
3. Classroom walk-throughs targeting CBC (Common Board Configuration) and evidence of focused note taking and processing will occur weekly by administration and instructional coaches.
4. Admins will collect and analyze CMA data collection guides quarterly and will support monthly CMA meetings as well as district supported department planning days.
5. Before and after school faculty tutoring will be provided and financed by Cares Act Funds.
6. The AVID Student Tutoring Center will occur during lunches for all subject areas twice a week.

**Person Responsible** Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

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

**Rationale:** For the 2020-2021 school year, Palm Bay Magnet High School will be implementing Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS). PBIS is a problem-solving, data-driven framework to improve outcomes for all students. We will be using evidenced-based practices to improve student academics and behavior. Data-compilation has revealed several areas that we will be focusing on as a team: decreasing in-school suspensions, out-school suspensions, and high-frequency disciplinary infractions.

## 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.

PBMHS has some challenges and kudos in regards to building a positive school culture and environment. According to the Winter 2019 Insight Data for Palm Bay Magnet High School, the Academic Opportunity section, decreased as 49% of teachers responded that they use the "Adopted Curriculum rather than materials found or created." A school wide effort by admins, resource teachers and department heads promoting the use of district curriculum will improve this aspect. Furthermore, CMA docs will be submitted to the AP Curriculum to ensure use of district adopted materials while progress monitoring student achievement.

In addition, the Learning Environment section decreased due to views on handling student behavior such as "consistency across campus in dealing with student behavior" along with "immediately addressing misbehavior in shared school spaces." This will be addressed with the implementation of the Positive Behavior Implementation and supports (PBIS). (More detail below).

The Hiring section of the Winter 2019 Insight Data was the strongest area due to providing teachers ample and extensive prep time during pre-planning and the PBMHS Teacher Support system for new teachers. New teachers are trained prior to the first day of school and during the school year with a gradual release model. That is teachers meet several times in August; however, monthly after that through the end of the year. They have mentors and or buddies to collaborate with and to use as a resource.

The January 2020 Youth Truth Survey revealed that PBMHS scored lowest in "Relationships" described as the "degree to which students feel they receive support and personal attention from their teachers including feeling teachers do not understand their challenges outside of school." This is exacerbated at our school because of the low socioeconomic community that we serve. Students indeed have a lot of outside factors that affect performance. PBMHS is implementing Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) this year which is a problem-solving data-driven framework to improve outcomes for all students. We will be using evidenced-based practices to improve student academics and behavior and the team is comprised of stakeholders from different positions and backgrounds.

Analysis of the 2019-2020 Parent Survey indicated the most effective method of parent communication is e-mail, text, Focus and phone calls. 36% of parents stated they never received communication from their child's teacher about their child's progress. As a result, we intend to continue to require FOCUS updates with Teacher communiques. Due to the current pandemic, all modes of communication have increased.

The Parent Survey also revealed that 93% of parents felt welcomed at PBMHS and 51% of parents felt "planning for college and career " is the most important parent resource while "FAFSA/Bright Futures

Information" at 35% is second. As a result, we plan to increase the frequency of these informational resources so that parents are informed.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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